LMU LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN

The local boundedness of gradients of weak solutions to elliptic and parabolic φ-Laplacian systems

Toni Scharle

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Master of Science

supervised by Prof. Dr. Lars Diening

May 2015

arXiv:1603.04715v1 [math.AP] 15 Mar 2016

Abstract

In this thesis, a unified approach to prove the boundedness of gradients of solutions to degenerate and singular elliptic and parabolic φ-Laplacian systems is presented. At first, a Cacciopoli-type energy inequality with an additional function f which can be chosen freely is proven. Then, Di Giorgi's method is applied using level sets which will lead to L^∞-estimates on the gradient of the weak solution $\nabla \mathbf{u}$.

Acknowledgements

At first I thank my supervisor Prof. Lars Dienig for his support and guidance.

I also thank Sebastian Schwarzacher for introducing me to this topic and his support throughout the process of writing of this thesis.

Last but not least I am grateful to my parents for their moral and financial support and to my friends and flatmates for making the time of my studies in Munich a truly great time.

Contents

1 Introduction **4**

2 N-Functions **8**

3 Energy estimates **13**
3.1 The elliptic case 13
3.2 The parabolic case 22

4 De-Giorgi-Techinque **28**
4.1 Preliminary Lemmas 28
4.2 The elliptic case 30
4.3 The parabolic case 32

5 Appendix **41**

1 Introduction

In 1900 David Hilbert gave his famous talk *"mathematical problems"*[1] where he described 25 at this moment unsolved problems whose solutions would "bring an advancement to science" [2].
The 19th problem reads:
"Are solutions to regular variational problems always necessarily analytic?"

One subclass of the variational problems Hilbert called regular are those with a given N-function (see section 2) φ and a domain Ω where we want to find a function $u \in W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$ (that means $\int_\Omega \varphi(|\nabla u|) < \infty$) such that the functional

$$\int\limits_\Omega \varphi(|\nabla u|)$$

is minimized under certain boundary conditions.
This leads to the elliptic Euler-Lagrange equation (defining $v := |\nabla u|$)

$$\Delta_\varphi u := \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\varphi'(v)}{v}\nabla u\right) = 0$$

The best known special case of this is $\varphi(t) = t^p$ for $p > 1$ where we get the p-Laplacian equation:

$$\Delta_p u := \operatorname{div}\left(v^{p-2}\nabla u\right) = 0$$

We are now interested in local minimizers of those functionals. This means we are looking for a function u with

$$\int\limits_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta} \varphi(|\nabla u|) \leq \int\limits_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta} \varphi(|\nabla u + \nabla\zeta|)$$

for all $\zeta \in C_0^1(\Omega)$. This leads to

$$\int\limits_\omega \frac{\varphi'(v)}{v}\nabla u \cdot \nabla\zeta = 0$$

for all $\zeta \in W_0^{1,\varphi}(\omega)$ with $\omega \Subset \Omega$.
Ennio de Giorgi proved in 1957 ([2]) the boundedness of solutions of linear elliptic equations with a truncation method that does not rely on the linearity of the problem and could be easily adopted to prove Hölder continuity of

[1] "Mathematische Probleme", see [1],translation by the author
[2] "von deren Behandlung eine Förderung der Wissenschaft sich erwarten lässt" see [1], translation by the author

the gradients of those solutions. Independently, Nash got similar results for linear elliptic and parabolic equations in [3] and later Moser proved Harnack estimates for those equations in [4].
The boundedness in cases which behave like the p-Laplacian equation was given by Uhlenbeck in 1976 in [5] in a context of differential forms for $p > 2$. The $1 < p < 2$ case was solved by Acerbi and Fisco in [6]. Evans proved in [7] qualitative L^∞ bounds by mollification for $p > 2$.
Marcellini and Papi proved an estimate on the gradient of solutions to elliptic φ-laplacian systems in [8]

$$\left(\sup_B v\right)^{2-\beta n} \lesssim \fint_{2B} \varphi(v) + 1$$

where β is a φ-dependent constant between $\frac{1}{n}$ and $\frac{2}{n}$. The restrictions on φ are so weak that some linear and exponential growth cases are included.
Diening, Stroffolini and Verde proved in 2009 ([9]) under the assumption 2.4 which we will also impose on φ the bound

$$\sup_B \varphi(v) \leq \fint_{2B} \varphi(v)$$

which we will get in theorem 4.4. This was further generalized (by substituting assumption 2.4 the weaker assumption $c\varphi'(t) \leq \varphi''(t)t \leq C(1+t)^{\frac{\omega}{2}}\varphi'(t)$ for some real $\omega > 0$) by Breit, Stroffolini and Verde in [10].
To get to this point we will use technical tools we develop in section 2 to get an energy inequality in section 3.1. We will use this to prove the mentioned L^∞-bound with iterated truncations $\chi_{\{v>\gamma\}}$ in section 4.2.

We will also look at the parabolic systems. We call a function $\mathbf{u} \in L^\varphi_{\text{loc}}(I \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \cap C_{\text{loc}}(I, L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m))$ with $v := |\nabla \mathbf{u}| \in L^\varphi_{\text{loc}}(I \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}) \cap L^2_{\text{loc}}(I \times \Omega, \mathbb{R})$ a local weak solution to $\mathbf{u}_t - \Delta_\varphi \mathbf{u} = 0$ on a cylindrical domain $I \times \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ if and only if we have for every $\omega \Subset \Omega$ and $[t_1, t_2] \Subset I$

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_\omega \frac{\varphi'(v)}{v} \nabla \mathbf{u} \nabla \boldsymbol{\zeta} \,\mathrm{d}t \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_\omega \mathbf{u} \partial_t \boldsymbol{\zeta} \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}t - \int_\omega \mathbf{u}\boldsymbol{\zeta} \,\mathrm{d}x \Big|_{t_1}^{t_2}$$

for every function $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in W^{1,2}_{\text{loc}}(I, L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m))$ with $|\nabla \boldsymbol{\zeta}| \in L^\varphi_{\text{loc}}(I \times \Omega)$. Equations like this appear for example in the study of non Newtonian fluids and other problems of continuum mechanics. (See [11].) For the parabolic p-Laplacian systems the most frequently used result is the one obtained by E. DiBenedetto in [12] in section VIII.3: If $\mathbf{u}$ is a local weak solution to $\mathbf{u}_t - \Delta_p \mathbf{u} = 0$ on a cylinder $I \times \Omega$ he proved, that on a cylinder $Q = J \times B \Subset I \times \Omega$ where B is a ball of radius R_x in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and J an interval of length $R_t = \alpha R_x^2$ and (with $\frac{\nu_r}{2} = \frac{n}{2}(p-2) + r$, $r \geq 2$):

$$\sup_Q \frac{v^2}{\alpha} \lesssim \fint_{2Q} v^p + \alpha^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \text{ for } p \geq 2$$

$$\sup_Q \frac{v^{\frac{\nu_r}{2}}}{\alpha^{\frac{r-p}{2-p}-\frac{n}{2}}} \lesssim \fint_{2Q} \frac{v^r}{\alpha^{\frac{p-r}{2-p}}} + \alpha^{\frac{p}{2-p}} \text{ for } p \leq 2$$

Although this is an important result, it has a drawback: If the integral on the right hand side tends to zero, the right hand side as a whole is still greater than $\alpha^{\frac{p}{2-p}}$ and therefore the theorem does not guarantee that if $\|v\|_p$ and $\|v\|_2$ go to zero the L^∞ norms also go to zero. The proof itself is not very straightforward and it needs at first a qualitative statement about v being in L^∞ to allow to absorb terms on the left hand side. It starts with the very same Caciopolli-type energy equation we will find in theorem 3.4 but uses another function f than we will do. Similar results were obtained earlier by DiBenedetto and Friedman in [13].
After proving an energy inequality for parabolic φ-Laplacian equation in section 3.2 we will get in section 4.3:

$$\min\left\{\frac{v^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{n}}}, \frac{v^2}{\alpha}\right\} \leq \fint_{2Q} \frac{v^2}{\alpha} + v^p$$

We see that we do not have to differentiate between the singular and degenerate cases which will allow us to generalize this result to the parabolic φ-Laplacian and whereas DiBenedetto's estimate just provides a constant bound for $v < \alpha^{p-2}$, we just have a switch of exponents. We need $\nu_2 > 0$ or $p > 2 - \frac{4}{n}$ and in this case $r = 2$ is the optimal exponent in DiBenedetto's estimate. For larger r there is also an estimate for smaller p provided. Those estimates need a higher integrability for v. DiBenedetto's result about the boundedness of gradients of solutions in the case $1 < p < 2$ was obtained earlier by Choe [14].
Acerbi and Mingone proved higher integrability for inhomogeneous p-Laplacian systems in [15] regaining $\nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^q_{\text{loc}}$ if $F \in L^q$ in the inhomogeneity $\nabla \cdot (|\mathbf{F}|^{p-2}\mathbf{F})$.

After proving the boundedness of the gradient of parabolic φ-Laplacian systems we could for example apply a result obtained by Liebermann in [16] where he proved Hölder continuity of gradients of those solutions if there is L^∞_{loc} regularity and φ fulfills assumption 2.4. He proved that, if we have a cylinder $J \times B =: Q \Subset I \times \Omega$ with spacial radius R_x, length of $|J| := R_t = \alpha R_x^2$ and $\alpha = \frac{M}{\varphi'(M)}$ and $\sup_Q v \leq M$ we have for a smaller cylinder $Q' := B' \times J'$ with spacial radius r_x and $|J'| = r_t = \alpha r_x^2$ and a positive exponent μ:

$$\operatorname{osc}_{Q'} |\nabla \mathbf{u}| \lesssim M \left(\frac{r_x}{R_x} \right)^{\mu}$$

This implies Hölder continuity of $\nabla \mathbf{u}$. This means, if we have an $\|v\|_\infty = M_0$ on some cylinder Q_0 we have Hölder continuity on all cylinders $Q \subset Q_0$ with $\alpha = \frac{M_0}{\varphi'(M_0)}$.

2 N-Functions

We use some standard results and definitions from [17] and [18] and start with the definition of an N-Function:

Definition 2.1. *Let $\varphi' : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ be a non-decreasing, left-continuous function with $\varphi'(0) = 0$, $\varphi'(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varphi(t) = \infty$. Then we call the convex function*

$$\varphi(t) := \int_0^t \varphi'(s)\,\mathrm{d}s$$

an N-Function.

Some common examples are $\varphi(t) = t^p$ or $\varphi(t) = t\log(t+1)$.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain. The set of measurable functions $\mathbf{u} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\int_\Omega \varphi(|\mathbf{u}|) < \infty$ is called the Orlicz class $L^\varphi(\Omega)$. Its span is called Orlicz space $K^\varphi(\Omega)$. On this span we can define the so called Luxemburg norm via

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_\varphi = \inf\left\{ t > 0 : \int_\Omega \varphi\left(\frac{|\mathbf{u}(x)|}{t}\right)\,\mathrm{d}x \le 1 \right\}$$

Definition 2.2. *For a given N-function we define*

$$\varphi'^{-1}(t) = \inf\{s \ge 0 : \varphi'(s) > t\}$$

the complementary N-function via

$$\varphi^*(t) = \int_0^t \left(\varphi'\right)^{-1}(s)\,\mathrm{d}s$$

It is easy to see that if φ is strictly increasing, φ'^{-1} is the true inverse function of φ'.
The main reason for this definition is Young's inequality:

$$st \le \varphi(s) + \varphi^*(t)$$

This result is standard and can be found in any textbook about Orlicz spaces, for example [18].
With our definition of the Luxemburg norm we also get a Hölder type inequality:

$$\int_\Omega \mathbf{fg} \le 2\|\mathbf{f}\|_\varphi \|\mathbf{g}\|_{\varphi^*}$$

Definition 2.3. *The N-Function φ is said to fulfill the Δ_2-condition if and only if we have a constant c independent of t such that*

$$\varphi(2t) \leq c\varphi(t)$$

As φ is strictly increasing we can find a constant for every $a > 0$ such that $\varphi(at) \leq c\varphi(t)$ uniformly in t. This also implies that the Orlicz-class $L^\varphi(\Omega)$ is a vector space and we therefore have $L^\varphi(\Omega) = K^\varphi(\Omega)$. We will denote the smallest constant c fulfilling $\varphi(2t) \leq c\varphi(t)$ uniformly in t by $\Delta_2(\varphi)$ and for a family of N-Functions φ_s we will denote $\Delta_2(\{\varphi_s\}) := \sup_s\{\Delta_2(\varphi_s)\}$.
If $\Delta_2(\varphi) < \infty$ we get

$$\varphi(t) \sim t\varphi'(t) \tag{2.1}$$

because of $\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \varphi'(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq \varphi'(t)$ and $\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \geq \frac{\varphi(2t)}{t\Delta_2(\varphi)} = \frac{1}{t\Delta_2(\varphi)}\int_0^t \varphi'(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{t\Delta_2(\varphi)}\int_t^{2t} \varphi'(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \geq \frac{1}{\Delta_2(\varphi)}\varphi'(t)$.
If we have $\Delta_2(\varphi^*) < \infty$, we get

$$\varphi^*(t) \sim t\left(\varphi^*\right)'(t) = t\left(\varphi'\right)^{-1}(t)$$

and therefore after setting $t = \varphi'(s)$:

$$\varphi^*\left(\varphi'(s)\right) \sim \varphi'(s)s \sim \varphi(s) \tag{2.2}$$

If we have $\Delta_2(\{\varphi, \varphi^*\}) < \infty$ we also get from Young's inequality, that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ exists a $c_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$st \leq \varepsilon\varphi(s) + c_\varepsilon\varphi^*(t)$$

In this thesis we will usually impose a stronger condition than the Δ_2-condition on φ:

Assumption 2.4.

$$\varphi'(t) \sim \varphi''(t)t \tag{2.3}$$

We remark that this implies that φ fulfills the Δ_2-condition.

Definition 2.5. *For a given N-function φ we define the following functions for $\lambda, t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and $\boldsymbol{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi'_\lambda(t) &:= \frac{\varphi'(\lambda + t)}{\lambda + t}t \\
\psi'(t) &:= \sqrt{\varphi'(t)t} \\
\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{Q}) &:= \frac{\varphi'(|\boldsymbol{Q}|)}{|\boldsymbol{Q}|}\boldsymbol{Q} \\
\boldsymbol{V}(\boldsymbol{Q}) &:= \frac{\psi'(|\boldsymbol{Q}|)}{|\boldsymbol{Q}|}\boldsymbol{Q}
\end{aligned}$$

We will now prove some useful estimates on those quantities.

Theorem 2.6. *With the Definitions as above and φ with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi, \varphi^*\}) < \infty$ fulfilling assumption 2.4 we have for all $\boldsymbol{P}, \boldsymbol{Q}, \boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$:*

(a) $\partial_{ij} A_{kl}(\boldsymbol{P}) = \frac{\varphi'(|\boldsymbol{P}|)}{|\boldsymbol{P}|}\left(\tilde{\delta}_{ik}\tilde{\delta}_{jl} - \frac{P_{ij}P_{kl}}{|\boldsymbol{P}|^2}\right) + \varphi''(|\boldsymbol{P}|)\frac{P_{ij}P_{kl}}{|\boldsymbol{P}|^2}$ *for all* $\boldsymbol{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ *where $\tilde{\delta}_{ji}$ is the Kronecker Delta.*

(b) $|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{P}) - \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{Q})| \lesssim \varphi''(|\boldsymbol{P}| + |\boldsymbol{Q}|)|\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}|$

(c) $\varphi''(|\boldsymbol{P}| + |\boldsymbol{Q}|)|\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}| \sim \varphi'_{|\boldsymbol{P}|}(|\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}|)$

(d) $|\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}|^2\varphi''(|\boldsymbol{P}| + |\boldsymbol{Q}|) \sim \varphi_{|\boldsymbol{P}|}(|\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}|) \sim |\boldsymbol{V}(\boldsymbol{P}) - \boldsymbol{V}(\boldsymbol{Q})|^2 \sim (\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{P}) - \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{Q}))(\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q})$

(e) $\varphi'_{|\boldsymbol{P}|}(|\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}|) \lesssim \varphi'_{|\boldsymbol{R}|}(|\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{R}|) + \varphi'_{|\boldsymbol{R}|}(|\boldsymbol{Q} - \boldsymbol{R}|)$

Proof. (a) We use $\partial_{ij}P_{kl} = \tilde{\delta}_{ik}\tilde{\delta}_{jl}$ and $\partial_{ij}|\mathbf{P}| = \frac{P_{ij}}{|\mathbf{P}|}$

$$\partial_{ij}\left(\frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}|)}{|\mathbf{P}|}P_{kl}\right) = \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}|)}{|\mathbf{P}|}\tilde{\delta}_{ik}\tilde{\delta}_{jl} + \frac{\varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|)}{|\mathbf{P}|}\frac{P_{ij}}{|\mathbf{P}|}P_{kl} - \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}|)}{|P|^2}\frac{P_{ij}}{|\mathbf{P}|}P_{kl}$$

(b) Define the convex combination $[\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}]_s := (s\mathbf{P} + (1-s)\mathbf{Q})$ and estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q})| &= \left|\int_0^1 (\nabla \mathbf{A})([\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}]_s)(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q})\,\mathrm{d}s\right| \\
&\lesssim \int_0^1 \frac{\varphi'(|[\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}]_s|)}{|[\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}]_s|}\,\mathrm{d}s|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| \\
&\lesssim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|)}{|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|}|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| \\
&\lesssim \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality $\int_0^1 \frac{\varphi'(|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|)}{|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|}\,\mathrm{d}s \lesssim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)}{|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|}$ is proven in the appendix in lemma 5.6.

(c) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi''(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| &\sim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|)}{|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|}|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| \\
\sim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|)}{|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|}|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| &\sim \varphi'_{|\mathbf{P}|}(|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption 2.4 on φ, the Δ_2-condition and the fact that $|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}| \sim |\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|$ via $|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}| = |\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{P}| \leq 2|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{P}|$ and $|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| \leq 2|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|$.

(d) The first similarity follows directly from point (c) and $\varphi'(t)t \sim \varphi(t)$
For the second similarity we first note that the N-function ψ fulfills assumption 2.4 and that we have $\psi''(t) \sim \sqrt{\varphi''(t)}$. (Both facts are proven in the appendix in lemma 5.7.) This means we can replace φ by ψ and $\mathbf{A}$ by $\mathbf{V}$ in the proof of part (b) and get

$$|\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Q})|^{\mathbf{2}} \sim |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|^{\mathbf{2}} \left(\psi''(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|)\right)^{\mathbf{2}} \sim |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|^{\mathbf{2}} \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|)$$

For the third similarity we use the the compatibility of Frobenius-Norm with Matrix multiplication and point (b) to get:

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q}))(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q})| \leq & |\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q})| \, |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| \\ \lesssim & \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{Q}|)|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

For the other direction we first note that we get for every $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ij} \left(\partial_{ij} A_{kl}\right)(P) B_{kl} = & \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}|)}{|\mathbf{P}|} \left(|\mathbf{B}|^2 - \frac{|\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{B}|^2}{|\mathbf{P}|^2} \right) + \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|) \frac{|\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{B}|^2}{|\mathbf{P}|^2} \\ \geq & c\varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|) \left(|\mathbf{B}|^2 - \frac{|\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{B}|^2}{|P|^2} \right) + \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|) \frac{|\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{B}|^2}{|\mathbf{P}|^2} \\ = & (c - \varepsilon)\varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|) \left(|\mathbf{B}|^2 - \frac{|\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{B}|^2}{|\mathbf{P}|^2} \right) + \varepsilon \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|)|\mathbf{B}|^2 \\ & + (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|) \frac{|\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{B}|^2}{|\mathbf{P}|^2} \\ \geq & \varepsilon \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}|)|\mathbf{B}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used point (a) and took $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\frac{\varphi'(t)}{t} \geq c\varphi''(t)$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \min\{1, c\}$.
We then estimate $(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q}))(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q})$ using 5.6 and the fact that φ fulfills assumption 2.4:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q}))(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}) = & \int_0^1 (\nabla \mathbf{A})([\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{S}]_s)(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q})(\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}) \, \mathrm{d}s \\ \gtrsim & \int_0^1 \varphi''(|[\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{S}]_s) \, \mathrm{d}s |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|^2 \\ \sim & \varphi''(|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{S}|)|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

(e) Let us at first assume that $|\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{R}| \leq |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{R}|$ and therefore $|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}| \leq |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{Q}| \leq |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{R}| + |\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{R}| \leq 2|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{R}|$. We also recall

that $\Delta_2(\varphi_\lambda)$ is bound uniformly in λ as proven in lemma 5.8 and we therefore get $\varphi'_\lambda(2s) \sim \varphi'_\lambda(t)$ uniformly in t and λ. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi'_{|\mathbf{P}|}(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|) &\leq \varphi'_{|\mathbf{P}|}(2|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|) \\
&\sim \varphi'_{|\mathbf{P}|}(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|) \\
&= \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|+|\mathbf{P}|)}{|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|+|\mathbf{P}|}|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}| \\
&\sim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|+|\mathbf{R}|)}{|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|+|\mathbf{R}|}|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}| \\
&= \varphi'_{|\mathbf{R}|}(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|) \\
&\leq \varphi'_{|\mathbf{R}|}(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}|) + \varphi'_{|\mathbf{R}|}(|\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}|)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}| = |\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{Q}| + |\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}| < 2(|\mathbf{Q}| + |\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|)$ and therefore $|\mathbf{P}| + |\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}| \sim |\mathbf{Q}| + |\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|$. As we have $\frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|+|\mathbf{P}|)}{|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|+|\mathbf{P}|}|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}| \sim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)}{|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|+|\mathbf{Q}|}|\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}|$ like in the 4th step we can interchange the roles of $|\mathbf{P}|$ and $|\mathbf{Q}|$.

□

3 Energy estimates

3.1 The elliptic case

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 (Energy estimate for the elliptic case)**.** *Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\}) < \infty$ satisfying the assumption 2.4 and let $\boldsymbol{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)$ be a local weak solution to*

$$\Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0$$

on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^+_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-decreasing, non-negative, bounded, piecewise continuously differentiable function which is constant for large arguments. Define $\boldsymbol{V}(\boldsymbol{Q}) = \frac{\sqrt{\varphi'(|\boldsymbol{Q}|)}}{|\boldsymbol{Q}|}\boldsymbol{Q}$ as above and denote $v = |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}|$ and let $B \Subset \Omega$ be a ball of radius R and η a $C^\infty_0(B)$ function with $0 \le \eta \le 1$. Then we get for some $q > 2$:

$$\fint_B |\nabla \boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2 \eta^q f(v) \lesssim \fint_B \varphi(v)|\nabla\eta|^2 f(v) \tag{3.1}$$

Before we prove this we restrict the choice of f.

Lemma 3.2. *The assertion of theorem 3.1 holds with the additional assumption $f \in C^1$ with $f'(t) \ge 0$ and $f'(t) = 0$ for t large enough.*

Proof. We denote $(\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{g})(x) := \mathbf{g}(x + he_j) - \mathbf{g}(x)$, $(\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{g})(x) = \frac{1}{h}(\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{g})(x)$ and $\delta_h\mathbf{g} := \sum_{j=1}^n (\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{g})e_j$ and take a C^∞_0 function η with $\operatorname{supp}\eta \subset B$ and $0 \le \eta \le 1$. We use the test function $\zeta := \delta_{j,-h}(f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|))\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\,\eta^q$ where we chose $q > 2$ such that $\varphi(\eta^{q-1}t) \le \eta^q\varphi(t)$ which is possible because of lemma 5.9 and we note that q only depends on φ and not on η. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& \langle \mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u}), \nabla(\delta_{j,-h}(f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\,\eta^q))\rangle = \langle \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u}), \nabla(f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\,\eta^q)\\
=& \langle \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u}), f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\nabla|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\,\eta^q\rangle + \langle \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u}), f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\delta_{j,h}\nabla\mathbf{u}\rangle\\
&+ \langle \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u}), f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\,q\eta^{q-1}\nabla\eta\rangle\\
=:& \mathrm{I}_j + \mathrm{II}_j + \mathrm{III}_j
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

We will at first look at I_j in 3.2. We note that $|\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}|f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|) \le |\delta_h\mathbf{u}|f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)$ is bounded uniformly in h because of $f'(t) = 0$ for large t. For the integrand of I_j this gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\nabla|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\eta^q|\\
\le& |\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|\,|\nabla|\delta_h\mathbf{u}||\,|f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}|\\
\lesssim& \frac{1}{h^2}|\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|\,|\tau_h\nabla\mathbf{u}|
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

We now use 2.6 (b) and (c)

$$\begin{aligned}|(\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{A})(x)| &= |\mathbf{A}((\nabla\mathbf{u})(x+h)) - \mathbf{A}((\nabla\mathbf{u})(x))| \\ &\lesssim \varphi''(|(\nabla\mathbf{u})(x+h)| + |(\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)|)|(\tau_{j,h}\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)| \\ &\sim \varphi'_{|\nabla\mathbf{u}|}(|(\tau_{j,h}\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)|) \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Using this we return to 3.3 and denote $\max_{j=1,2\dots,n} |\tau_{j,h}\nabla\mathbf{u}| = |\tau_{j_0,h}\nabla\mathbf{u}|$ and note that for $n < \infty$ all p-norms of $\mathbb{R}^n$ including the supremum norm are equivalent and estimate using the fact that $\varphi'_{|\nabla\mathbf{u}|}$ is increasing and 2.6 (d):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{h^2}|(\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{A})(x)|\,|\tau_h\nabla\mathbf{u}| &\sim \frac{1}{h^2}\varphi'_{|\nabla\mathbf{u}|}(|(\tau_{j,h}\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)|)\,|\tau_h\nabla\mathbf{u}| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{h^2}\varphi'_{|\nabla\mathbf{u}|}(|(\tau_{j_0,h}\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)|)\,|\tau_{h,j_0}\nabla\mathbf{u}| \\ &\sim \frac{1}{h^2}\varphi_{|\nabla\mathbf{u}|}(|(\tau_{j_0,h}\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)|) \\ &\sim \frac{1}{h^2}|\tau_{j_0,h}\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)|^2 \\ &\sim |\delta_h\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})(x)|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

As $h \to 0$, this goes to $|\nabla\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2$ in $L^2(B)$ since $\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u}) \in W^{1,2}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ as proven in Theorem 5.11. This means we can use a generalized version of the theorem of dominated convergence of Lebesgue which says that if $f_n \to f$ pointwise almost everywhere and $|f_n| < g_n$ for an L^1 convergent sequence g_n we have $\int f_n \to \int f$.
We now need $\delta_{k,h}v \to \partial_k v$, $\delta_{j,h}(A_{ki}(\nabla u)) \to \partial_{lp}A_{ki}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\partial_j\partial_l u_p$ and $\delta_{j,h}u_i \to \partial_j u_i$. This would be implied by $\nabla\mathbf{u} \in W^{2,1}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$. It would be possible to show this for a shifted N-function φ_λ with $\lambda > 0$ and then we'd have to take the limit $\lambda \to 0$ in the end like in [9]. For the sake of clarity and simplicity we will just assume this here. This gives (using the Einstein summation convention and writing $\tilde{\delta}_{ij}$ for the Kronecker-Delta and after a summation

over j):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I} :=& \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathrm{I}_j = \int_B \delta_k v \delta_j \left(A_{ki}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right) \delta_j u_i f'(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
\to& \int_B \partial_k v \left(\partial_{lp} A_{ki}\right)(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \partial_j \partial_l u_p \partial_j u_i f'(v)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
=& \int_B \partial_k v \left(\frac{\varphi'(v)}{v} \left(\tilde{\delta}_{lk} \tilde{\delta}_{pi} - \frac{\partial_l u_p \partial_k u_i}{v^2} \right) + \varphi''(v) \frac{\partial_l u_p\, \partial_k u_i}{v^2} \right) \partial_j \partial_l u_p\, \partial_j u_i f'(v)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
=& \int_B \frac{\varphi'(v)}{v} \left(\partial_l v\, \partial_j \partial_l u_i\, \partial_j u_i - \frac{\partial_k v\, \partial_k u_i\, \partial_j \partial_l u_p\, \partial_l u_p \partial_k u_i}{v^2} \right) f'(v)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&+ \int_B \varphi''(v) \frac{\partial_k v\, \partial_k u_i\, \partial_j \partial_l u_p\, \partial_l u_p \partial_k u_i}{v^2} f'(v)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
=& \int_B \left(\frac{\varphi'(v)}{v} \left(|\nabla v|^2 - \frac{|\nabla v \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}|^2}{v^2} \right) + \varphi''(v) \frac{|\nabla v \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}|^2}{v^2} \right) f'(v)\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have $f' \geq 0$ and $|\nabla v \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \leq v^2 |\nabla v|^2$ because of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \mathrm{I} \geq 0 \tag{3.6}$$

To estimate II_j we apply theorem 2.6(d) and get like in [19]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\tau_{j,h} \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}))(x) \cdot (\tau_{j,h} \nabla \mathbf{u})(x) \\
&\quad = (\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}(x+h)) - \mathbf{A}((\nabla \mathbf{u})(x))) \cdot (\tau_{j,h} \nabla u)(x) \\
&\quad \sim |(\tau_{j,h} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}))(x)|^2
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing by h^2 gives

$$(\delta_{j,h} \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}))(x) \cdot (\delta_{j,h} \delta \mathbf{u})(x) \sim |(\delta_{j,h} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}))(x)|^2$$

Using this we get

$$\mathrm{II}_j = \langle \delta_{j,h} \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}), f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) \delta_{j,h} \nabla \mathbf{u}\, \eta^q \rangle \sim \fint_B |\delta_{j,h} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) \eta^q \tag{3.7}$$

We use 3.4 to estimate III_j and note that

$$|(\delta_{j,h} \mathbf{u})(x)| = \left| \fint_0^h (\partial_j \mathbf{u})(x + s e_j)\,\mathrm{d}s \right| \leq \fint_0^h |(\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{s e_j})(x)|\,\mathrm{d}s$$

This gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathrm{III}_j| =& |\langle \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}), f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\, q\eta^{q-1}\nabla\eta\rangle| \\
\lesssim& \frac{1}{h^2}\fint_B \int_0^h \eta^{q-1}\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}|}(|\tau_{j,h}\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|\, h|\nabla\eta| f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\,\mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}
$$

We now estimate the integrand using theorem 2.6 (e), Young's inequality, equation 2.2, $h|\nabla\eta| \leq 1$ with Lemma 5.10 and theorem 2.6 (d):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\eta^{q-1}\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}|}(|\tau_h\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|\, h|\nabla\eta| \\
\lesssim&\eta^{q-1}\left(\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}(|\tau_{j,h-s}\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|) + \varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}(|\tau_s\nabla \mathbf{u}|)\right) h|\nabla\eta|\,|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}| \\
\leq&\varepsilon\left(\varphi_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}\right)^*\left(\eta^{q-1}\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}(|\tau_{j,h-s}\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|)\right) \\
&+\varepsilon\left(\varphi_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}\right)^*\left(\eta^{q-1}\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}(|\tau_s\nabla \mathbf{u}|)\right) \\
&+c_\varepsilon\varphi_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}\left(h|\nabla\eta|\,|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|\right) \\
\lesssim&\varepsilon\eta^q\left(\varphi_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}\right)^*\left(\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}(|\tau_{j,h-s}\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|)\right) \\
&+\varepsilon\eta^q\left(\varphi_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}\right)^*\left(\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}(|\tau_s\nabla \mathbf{u}|)\right) \\
&+c_\varepsilon h^2|\nabla\eta|^2\varphi\left(|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|\right) \\
\lesssim&\varepsilon\eta^q\varphi_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}\left(|\tau_{j,h-s}\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|\right) + \varepsilon\varphi_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|}\left(|\tau_s\nabla \mathbf{u}|\right) \\
&+c_\varepsilon h^2|\nabla\eta|^2\varphi\left(|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|\right) \\
\sim&\varepsilon\eta^q|\tau_{j,h-s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\circ T_{se_j}|^2 + \varepsilon\eta^q|\tau_{j,s}V(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 + c_\varepsilon h^2|\nabla\eta|^2\varphi\left(|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}
$$

Putting this in 3.8 we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathrm{III}_j| =& |\langle \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}), f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\, q\eta^{q-1}\nabla\eta\rangle| \\
\lesssim& \frac{\varepsilon}{h^2}\fint_B \int_0^h \left|\tau_{j,h-s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\circ T_{se_j}\right|^2 f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&+\frac{\varepsilon}{h^2}\fint_B \int_0^h |\tau_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&+c_\varepsilon\fint_B \int_0^h \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}\circ T_{se_j}|)|\nabla\eta|^2 f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\,\mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}
$$

Putting 3.7 and 3.10 in 3.2 we get after a summation over j

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{I}' :=& \mathrm{I} + \fint_B |\delta_h \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q \\
\lesssim & \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{m} \fint_B \int_0^h \left| \frac{\tau_{j,h-s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \circ T_{se_j}}{h} \right|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s \\
& + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{m} \fint_B \int_0^h \left| \frac{\tau_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla u)}{h} \right|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s \\
& + c_\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{m} \fint_B \int_0^h \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|)|\nabla \eta|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) \,\mathrm{d}s \\
=: & \ \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathrm{II}'_j + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathrm{III}'_j + c_\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathrm{IV}'_j
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

We now want to take the limit $h \to 0$ in 3.11 and know from equation 3.6 that $\lim_{h\to 0} \mathrm{I} \geq 0$ and note that $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in W^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ as proved in theorem 5.11. This means we have $\delta \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \to \nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ in $L^2(B)$. Since $\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ we also have $\delta_h \mathbf{u} \to \nabla \mathbf{u}$ and therefore $f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) \to f(v)$ pointwise almost everywhere for a subsequence and as $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B)$ η^q is uniformly continuous.
For I' this means (passing to this subsequence)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \fint_B |\delta_h \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q - \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(v)\eta^q \right| \\
\leq & \fint_B \left| |\delta_h \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 - |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \right| f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q \\
& + \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \, |f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}) - f(v)|\eta^q \\
=: & \ \mathrm{I}'_1 + \mathrm{I}'_2
\end{aligned}$$

Since $f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q \leq \|f\|_\infty$ and $\delta \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \to \nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ in $L^2(B)$ I'_1 tends to zero. For the integrand in I'_2 we have the dominating function $\|f\|_\infty |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2$ and this summand also goes to zero by dominated convergence as $f(|\delta_{\mathbf{u}}|) \to f(v)$ pointwise almost everywhere. In total this gives

$$\mathrm{I}' \to \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(v)\eta^q \tag{3.12}$$

We now look at IV'_j and use the theorem of Fubini-Tonelli:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \fint_B \int_0^h \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|)|\nabla\eta|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\,\mathrm{d}s - \fint_B \int_0^h \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla\eta|^2 f(v)\,\mathrm{d}s \right| \\
\leq &\fint_B \int_0^h \left| \left(\varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|) - \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)\right) |\nabla\eta|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) \right| \mathrm{d}s \\
+ &\fint_B |\varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla\eta|^2 \left(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) - f(v)\right)| \\
\lesssim &\|f|\nabla\eta|^2\|_\infty \fint_0^h \fint_B |\varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|) - \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&+ \fint_B \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) - f(v)|\,|\nabla\eta|^2 \\
=: &\mathrm{IV}'_{j,1} + \mathrm{IV}'_{j,2}
\end{aligned}$$

To show $\mathrm{IV}'_{j,2} \to 0$ we use dominated convergence with the dominant $\varphi(v)\|f|\nabla\eta|^2\|_\infty$ and $f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) \to f(v)$ pointwise almost everywhere for a subsequence as above. To estimate $\mathrm{IV}'_{j,1}$ we use the L^φ-continuity of translations and the third implication in lemma 5.2 and observe that

$$g:\ s \mapsto \fint_B \left|\varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|) - \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)\right|$$

is a continuous function with $g(0) = 0$. But with the fundamental theorem of calculus we have

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h g(s)\,\mathrm{d}s = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}h} \int_0^h g(s)\,\mathrm{d}s = g(0) = 0$$

and therefore $\mathrm{IV}'_{j,1} \to 0$ and after choosing a subsequence we get

$$\mathrm{IV}'_j \to \fint_B \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla\eta|^2 f(v) \tag{3.13}$$

We now want to estimate III'_j (from 3.11) and observe using $h > s$:

$$\mathrm{III}'_j = \fint_B \int_0^h \left| \frac{\tau_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})}{h} \right|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}s \leq \fint_0^h \int_B |\delta_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}s =: \mathrm{III}''_j$$

We estimate this term:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \fint_0^h \fint_B |\delta_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s - \fint_0^h \fint_B |\,|\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(v)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s \right| \\
\leq &\|f\|_\infty \fint_0^h \fint_B \left| |\delta_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 - |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \right| \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&+ \fint_0^h \fint_B |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 |f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) - f(v)|\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s| \\
=: &\mathrm{III}''_{j,1} + \mathrm{III}''_{j,2}
\end{aligned}$$

We have $\mathrm{III}''_{j,2} \to 0$ for $h \to 0$ in a subsequence as we had $\mathrm{IV}'_{j,2} \to 0$ as the integrand is bounded by $\|f\|_\infty |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \in L^1(B)$ and we can use dominated convergence.
To estimate $\mathrm{III}''_{j,1}$ we note that if $w_n \to w$ in L^2 also $\|w_n\|_{L^2} \to \|w\|_{L^2}$ and we get using $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in W^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$:

$$s \mapsto \fint_B (|\delta_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 - |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2)$$

is also a continuous function which is 0 at $s = 0$ and using the same arguments we used for IV'_j we get $\mathrm{III}''_{j,1} \to 0$ and therefore

$$\mathrm{III}'_j \leq \mathrm{III}''_j \to \fint_B |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 f(v)\eta^q \tag{3.14}$$

For II'_j in 3.11 we first use the invariance of the Lebesgue measure under translations. We also chose h small enough that the closure of the ball B' with the same center as B and radius $r+h$ is contained in Ω which is possible since $B \Subset \Omega$ and get

$$\begin{aligned}
|B|\mathrm{II}'_J = &|B| \fint_B \fint_0^h \left| \frac{\tau_{j,h-s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \circ T_{se_j}}{h} \right|^2 f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s \\
\leq &\fint_0^h \int_{B'} \left| \frac{\tau_{j,h-s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})}{h-s} \right|^2 \left((\eta^q f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)) \circ T_{-se_j} \right) \,\mathrm{d}s \\
= &\fint_0^h \int_{B'} \left| \frac{\tau_s \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})}{s} \right|^2 \left((\eta^q f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)) \circ T_{(s-h)e_j} \right) \,\mathrm{d}s =: \mathrm{II}''_j
\end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left| \fint_0^h \int_{B'} |\delta_{s,j}\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \left((\eta^q f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)) \circ T_{(s-h)e_j} \right) - |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 f(v)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s \right| \\
\leq &\fint_0^h \int_{B'} \left| |\delta_{s,j}\mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 - |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \right| \, (\eta^q f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)) \circ T_{(s-h)e_j} \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&+ \fint_0^h \int_{B'} |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \left| (\eta^q f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)) \circ T_{(s-h)e_j} - (\eta^q f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)) \circ T_{-he_j} \right| \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&+ \fint_0^h \int_{B'} |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \left| (\eta^q f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)) \circ T_{-he_j} - \eta^q f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|) \right| \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&+ \fint_0^h \int_{B'} |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \, |f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|) - f(v)| \, \eta^q \,\mathrm{d}s \\
=: &\mathrm{II}_1'' + \mathrm{II}_2'' + \mathrm{II}_3'' + \mathrm{II}_4''
\end{aligned}
$$

We have $\mathrm{II}_1'' \to 0$ for the same reasons as $\mathrm{IV}_{j,1}' \to 0$ and $\mathrm{III}_{j,1}' \to 0$. The integrands of II_2'' and II_3'' are bounded by the L^1_{loc}-function $\|f\|_\infty |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2$ and go to zero for $s \to 0$ pointwise almost everywhere. This means the integrals over B' go to zero and we can use the fundamental theorem as before. We get $\mathrm{II}_4'' \to 0$ via dominated convergence like $\mathrm{III}_{j,2}''$.
This means in the end (using also $\mathrm{supp}\eta \subset B$):

$$
\mathrm{II}_j' \leq \frac{1}{|B|} \mathrm{II}_j'' \to \fint_B |\partial_j \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 f(v) \eta^q \tag{3.15}
$$

Now we can let $h \to 0$ in 3.11 and get using 3.12, 3.13, 3.14 and 3.15

$$
\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \zeta^q f(v) \lesssim 2\varepsilon \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla\mathbf{u})|^2 \zeta^q f(v) + c_\varepsilon \fint_B \varphi(v) |\nabla\zeta|^2 f(v) \tag{3.16}
$$

We choose ε small enough that we can absorb the first summand of the right hand side on the left hand side and the proof for $f \in C^1$ is concluded. □

Proof of theorem 3.1. For the case of a general non decreasing bounded piecewise differentiable function f approximate it by a sequence of non-decreasing, uniformly bounded C^1 functions f_k with $\lim_{k\to\infty} f_k(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$. We use 3.2 and get

$$\fint_B D_k := \fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \eta^q f_k(v) \lesssim \fint_B \varphi(v) |\nabla \eta|^2 f_k(v) =: \fint_B E_k$$

As we have $f_k \to f$ pointwise everywhere, we get $D_k \to D_\infty$ and $E_k \to E_\infty$ almost everywhere. As we have $E_k \leq \|f\|_\infty |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \eta^q \in L^1(B)$ and $E_k \leq \|f\|_\infty \varphi(v) |\nabla \eta|^2 \in L^1(B)$, we can use dominated convergence and get the desired result. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi, \varphi^*\})$ satisfying the assumption 2.4 and let $\boldsymbol{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ be a local weak solution to $\Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0$ and $G(t) := (\psi'(t) - \psi'(\gamma))_+$ with a non negative real number γ*
Then we have

$$\fint_B |\nabla \left(G(v) \eta^{\frac{q}{2}} \right)|^2 \lesssim \fint_B \varphi(v) \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} |\nabla \eta|^2 \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. We use $f(t) = \chi_{\{t>\gamma\}}$. With theorem 3.1 we get

$$\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \eta^q \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} \lesssim \fint_B \varphi(v) |\nabla \eta|^2 \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}}$$

For the left hand side we use that $|(|\mathbf{Q}|)'| = |\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{|\mathbf{Q}|}| \leq 1$ and $(x_+)' = \chi_{\mathbb{R}^+}(x)$ which are both bounded which means that we can apply the chain rule for sobolev functions and $\chi_{t>\gamma} = \chi^2_{\{t>\gamma\}}$ almost everywhere:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_B |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \eta^q \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} \geq \fint_B |\nabla \left(|\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})| \right)|^2 \eta^q \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} \\
=&\fint_B \left| \nabla \left(\psi'(v) \right) \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} \eta^{\frac{q}{2}} \right|^2 \geq \fint_B \left| \nabla \left(\psi'(v) - \psi'(\gamma) \right) \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} \eta^{\frac{q}{2}} \right|^2 \\
=&\fint_B \left| \nabla \left(\left(\psi'(v) - \psi'(\gamma) \right)_+ \right) \eta^{\frac{q}{2}} \right|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

As we also have $G^2(v) \leq \psi'(v)^2 \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} \sim \varphi(v) \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}}$ and $|\nabla(\eta^{\frac{q}{2}})| = \frac{q}{2} \eta^{\frac{q}{2}-1} |\nabla \eta| \lesssim |\nabla \eta|$ we get

$$\fint_B G^2(v) \left| \nabla \left(\eta^{\frac{q}{2}} \right) \right|^2 \lesssim \fint_B \varphi(v) |\nabla \eta|^2 \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} \tag{3.19}$$

After adding 3.18 and 3.19 we conclude the proof with the product rule. □

3.2 The parabolic case

Theorem 3.4 (Energy estimate for the inelliptic case)**.** *Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\}) < \infty$ satisfying the assumption 2.4 and let $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^{\varphi}_{loc}(J\times\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)\cap L^2_{loc}(J\times\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| := v \in L^{\varphi}_{loc}(J\times\Omega)\cap L^2_{loc}(J\times\Omega)$ be a local weak solution to*

$$\Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = \partial_t \boldsymbol{u}$$

on a cylindrical domain $J\times\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^+_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-decreasing, piecewise continuously differentiable, bounded function which is constant for large arguments. Define $\boldsymbol{V}(\boldsymbol{Q}) = \frac{\sqrt{\varphi'(|\boldsymbol{Q}|)}}{|\boldsymbol{Q}|}\boldsymbol{Q}$ as usual and $H'(t) = tf(t)$ and let $Q := I\times B \Subset J\times\Omega$ be a cylinder where B is a ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of radius R_x and I an interval of length $R_t = \alpha R_x^2$ and η a $C^\infty_0(Q)$ function with $0\le\eta\le 1$.
Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha}\fint_B H(v)\eta^q + R_x^2 \fint_Q |\nabla \boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2\eta^q f(v)\\ \lesssim R_x^2\fint_Q |\boldsymbol{V}(\nabla\boldsymbol{u})|^2|\nabla\eta|^2 f(v) + R_x^2\fint_Q H(v)\eta^{q-1}\partial_t\zeta \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

As in the elliptic case, we start with a lemma restricting f to differentiable functions with $f' \ge 0$.

Lemma 3.5. *The assertion of theorem 3.4 holds with the additional assumption $f \in C^1$ with $f'(t) = 0$ for large t.*

Proof. As we do not have (weak) differentiability of $\mathbf{u}$ or v in t, we need to use a standard mollifier $\xi_\sigma(t)$ in one dimension and denote $g_\sigma = g * \xi_\sigma$ This is differentiable in time for all $\sigma > 0$ and converges to $g(x,t)$ in $L^\varphi(Q)$ for $\sigma \to 0$ if $g \in L^\varphi(Q)$.

For the equation this means using the test function $\mathbf{g}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_Q \left[\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma (t,x) \nabla \mathbf{g}(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
=&\int_Q \int \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})(t-\tau,x)\xi_\sigma(\tau)\nabla \mathbf{g}(t,x)\mathrm{d}\tau\,\mathrm{d}z \\
=&\int \int_Q \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})(t,x)\nabla \mathbf{g}(t+\tau,x)\,\mathrm{d}z\,\xi_\sigma(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
=&\int \int_Q \mathbf{u}(t,x)\left(\partial_t \mathbf{g}\right)(t+\tau,x)\,\mathrm{d}z\,\xi_\sigma(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
=&\int_Q \int \mathbf{u}(t-\tau,x)\,\xi_\sigma(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau\left(\partial_t \mathbf{g}\right)(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
=&\int_Q \mathbf{u}_\sigma\left(\partial_t \mathbf{g}\right)(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}z
\end{aligned}$$

We now use the test function $g(t,x) := \delta_{h,-j}(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q)$ where $\rho(t)$ is a C^∞-approximation of $\chi_{t>t_0}$ and after a summation over j using Einstein's summation convention and recalling $H'(t) = tf(t)$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_Q \left[\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \nabla \delta_{h,-j}(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
=&\fint_Q \mathbf{u}_\sigma\left(\partial_t \delta_{h,-j}(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q)\right)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&\fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \nabla(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
=&-\fint_Q \partial_t \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}z \\
=&-\fint_Q f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|\partial_t|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|\rho(t)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}z \\
=&-\fint_Q \partial_t H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}z = \fint_Q H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\partial_t(\rho(t)\eta^q)\,\mathrm{d}z
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \fint_Q H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\eta^q \partial_t \rho(t)\,\mathrm{d}z + \fint_Q H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|_\sigma)\rho(t)\partial_t \eta^q\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&= \fint_Q H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\partial_t \eta^q\,\mathrm{d}z - \fint_Q \rho(t)\partial_t \left(H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}z
\end{aligned}
$$

We now note that $\chi_{t_0,T} \leq 1$ and let $\rho \to \chi_{t_0,T}$ (as we have smoothed the functions the limits are easily justified by the dominated convergence theorem) and get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I} + \mathrm{II} :=& \fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \nabla(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q)\,\mathrm{d}z + \frac{1}{R_t}\fint_B \left(H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\Big|_{t=T} \\
\leq& \fint_Q H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\partial_t\left(\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}z := \mathrm{III} \qquad (3.21)
\end{aligned}
$$

We now want to take the limit $\sigma \to 0$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I} =& \fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma (\delta_{h,j}\nabla \mathbf{u}_\sigma) f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&+ \fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \nabla(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|))\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&+ \fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \rho(t)\nabla(\eta^q)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\,\mathrm{d}z =: \mathrm{I}_1 + \mathrm{I}_2 + \mathrm{I}_3
\end{aligned}
$$

We note that $\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in L^{\varphi^*}(Q)$ since

$$
\varphi^*\left(\left|\frac{\varphi'(v)}{v}\nabla \mathbf{u}\right|\right) = \varphi^*(\varphi'(v)) \sim \varphi(v) \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(J \times \Omega)
$$

And as $L^{\varphi^*}(Q)$ is a vector space because of $\Delta_2(\varphi^*) < \infty$, we also have $\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in L^{\varphi^*}(Q)$ and therefore $\left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \to \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$ in $L^{\varphi^*}(Q)$. This means we have for a general $g \in L^\varphi(Q)$ (with therefore $g_\sigma \to g$ in $L^\varphi(Q)$ and $||g_\sigma||_{L^\varphi(Q)}$ uniformly bounded):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma g_\sigma - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})g\,\mathrm{d}z\right| \\
\leq& \fint_Q \left|\left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right|\,|g_\sigma|\,\mathrm{d}z + \fint_Q |\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla u)|\,|g_\sigma - g|\,\mathrm{d}z \\
\leq& 2\|\left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\|_{L^{\varphi^*}}\|g_\sigma\|_{L^\varphi} + 2\|\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\|_{L^{\varphi^*}}\|g_\sigma - g\|_{L^\varphi} \to 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Using $\delta_{h,j}\nabla\mathbf{u} \in L^{\varphi}(Q)$ and dominated convergence we get for I_1:

$$\left| \fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla u)\right]_\sigma (\delta_{h,j}\nabla\mathbf{u}_\sigma) f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\eta^q - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{h,j}\nabla\mathbf{u} f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\rho(t)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}z \right|$$

$$\leq \|f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\eta^q\|_\infty \fint_Q \left| \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma (\delta_{h,j}\nabla\mathbf{u}_\sigma) - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{h,j}\nabla\mathbf{u} \right| \mathrm{d}z$$

$$+ \|\rho(t)\eta^q\|_\infty \fint_Q |\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{h,j}\nabla\mathbf{u}| \left| f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|) - f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|) \right| \mathrm{d}z \to 0$$

For I_2 we can use the chain rule since f is globally Lipschitz and differentiable:

$$\mathrm{I}_2 = \fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|) \frac{\delta_{h,k}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \nabla\delta_{h,k}\mathbf{u}_\sigma}{|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|} \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma \rho(t)\eta^q$$

We now see that $f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma$ is bounded uniformly in σ as $f'(t)t$ is bounded and therefore $\|f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\frac{\delta_{k,h}\mathbf{u}_\sigma\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma}{|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|}\|_\infty$ is uniformly bounded in σ. Using this, $\delta_{k,h}\nabla\mathbf{u} \in L^{\varphi}(Q)$ and dominated convergece we get

$$\Big| \fint_Q \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \delta_{k,h}\nabla\mathbf{u}_\sigma f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|) \frac{\delta_{k,h}\mathbf{u}_\sigma\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma}{|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|}\rho(t)\eta^q$$

$$-\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{k,h}\nabla\mathbf{u} f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\frac{\delta_{k,h}\mathbf{u}\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}}{|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|}\rho(t)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}z \Big|$$

$$\leq \left\| f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\frac{\delta_{k,h}\mathbf{u}_\sigma\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma}{|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|}\rho(t)\eta^q \right\|_\infty \fint_Q \left| \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \delta_{k,h}\nabla\mathbf{u}_\sigma - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{k,h}\nabla\mathbf{u} \right| \mathrm{d}z$$

$$+ \fint_Q \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla u)\delta_{k,h}\nabla\mathbf{u} \left| f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\frac{\delta_{k,h}\mathbf{u}_\sigma\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma}{|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|} - f'(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\frac{\delta_{k,h}\mathbf{u}\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}}{|\delta_{k,h}\mathbf{u}|} \right| \rho(t)\eta^q \,\mathrm{d}z \to 0$$

Treating I_3 works the same way as treating I_1 using that $\|f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\nabla\zeta\|_\infty$ is uniformly bounded in σ and $\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u} \in L^{\varphi}(Q)$:

$$\left| \fint_Q \left(\left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\nabla(\eta^q) - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u} f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|)\rho(t)\nabla(\eta^q) \right) \mathrm{d}z \right|$$

$$\leq \|f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\rho(t)\nabla(\eta^q)\|_\infty \fint_Q \left| \left[\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\right]_\sigma \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}_\sigma - \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u} \right| \mathrm{d}z$$

$$+ \fint_Q |\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla\mathbf{u})\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}| \left| f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}_\sigma|) - f(|\delta_h\mathbf{u}|) \right| |\rho(t)\nabla(\eta^q)| \,\mathrm{d}z \to 0$$

We now want to estimate II and III in equation 3.21. For this reason we first note for $b > a$:

$$|H(b) - H(a)| = \fint_a^b sf(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq \|f\|_\infty \fint_a^b s\,\mathrm{d}s = \frac{\|f\|_\infty}{2}\left(b^2 - a^2\right) \tag{3.22}$$

and since $\nabla \mathbf{u} \in L^2(Q, \mathbb{R}^m)$ we have $|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma| \to |\delta_h \mathbf{u}|$ in $L^2(Q)$ and get taking the limit $\sigma \to 0$:

$$\mathrm{II} \to \frac{1}{R_t} \fint_B \left(H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\Big|_{t=T}$$
$$\mathrm{III} \to \fint_Q H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\partial_t\left(\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}z$$

This means we can take the limit $\sigma \to 0$ and the supremum over all $T \in I$ in equation 3.21 and get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I'} + \mathrm{II'} :=& \fint_Q \delta_{h,j}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u})\nabla\left(f(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}_\sigma|)\delta_{h,j}\mathbf{u}\rho(t)\eta^q\right)\mathrm{d}z \\ &+ \frac{1}{R_t}\sup_I \fint_B \left(H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \fint_Q H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|)\partial_t\left(\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}z =: \mathrm{III'}\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

We now want take the limit $h \to 0$. Since $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(J, W^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega))$ (see Theorem 5.15) we can proceed as in the elliptic case (lemma 3.2) for term I'. For II' and III' we note that $\mathbf{u} \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(J, W^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega))$ and therefore $|\delta_h \mathbf{u}| \to v$ in $L^2(Q)$ as $h \to 0$. Using equation 3.22 we get

$$\mathrm{II'} \to \sup_I \frac{1}{R_t} \fint_B H(v)\eta^q\,\mathrm{d}x$$
$$\mathrm{III'} \to \fint_Q H(v)\partial_t\left(\eta^q\right)\,\mathrm{d}z$$

This means we can take the limit $h \to 0$ in equation 3.23 and multiply by R_x^2 to get

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha} \fint_B H(v)\eta^q + R_x^2 \fint_Q |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \eta^q f(v) \\ \lesssim& R_x^2 \fint_Q |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 f(v) + R_x^2 \fint_Q H(v)\eta^{q-1}\partial_t \eta\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of theorem 3.4. As in the proof of theorem 3.1, we approximate f by a sequence of uniformly bounded, non-decreasing C^1 functions f_k with $\lim_{k\to\infty} f_k(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$. As the f_k are uniformly bounded C^1 functions we can apply lemma 3.5 and get with $H_k(t) := \int_0^t s f_k(s)\,\mathrm{d}s$

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_I \fint_B A_k + \fint_Q B_k &:= \sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha} \fint_B H_k(v)\eta^q + R_x^2 \fint_Q |\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \eta^q f_k(v) \\ &\lesssim R_x^2 \fint_Q |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 f_k(v) + R_x^2 \fint_Q H_k(v)\eta^{q-1}\partial_t \eta =: \fint_Q C_k + \fint_Q D_k \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

We have $\|f_k\|_\infty \leq M$. As in the proof of theorem 3.1 B_k is bounded by the L^1-function $M|\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2\eta^q$ and C_k is bounded by $M|\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2|\nabla\eta|^2 \in L^1(Q)$.
For the other terms we note that $H_k(t) = \int_0^t s f_k(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq Ms^2$.This means we have $A_k \leq M\, v^2\eta^q \in L^1(Q)$ and $D_k \leq Mv^2\eta^{q-1}\partial_t\eta \in L^1(Q)$. This means we can take the limit $k \to \infty$ and use dominated convergence to conclude the proof. □

Corollary 3.6. *Let φ, $\boldsymbol{u}$ and v be as defined above and denote $G(t) := (\psi(t) - \psi(\gamma))_+$ and $H(t) = (v^2 - \gamma^2)_+$ with a non-negative real number γ. Then we get*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha} \fint_B H(v)\eta^q + R_x^2 \fint_Q |\nabla \left(G(v)\eta^{\frac{q}{2}}\right)|^2 \\ \lesssim& R_x^2 \fint_Q \varphi(v)\nabla\eta|^2 \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}} + R_x^2 \fint_Q H(v)\eta^{q-1}\partial_t\eta \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Proof. We use $f(t) = \chi_{\{t>\gamma\}}$. This leads to $H(t) = \int_\gamma^t s\,\mathrm{d}s_+ = (t^2-\gamma^2)_+$ as claimed. To get $⨍_Q |\nabla V(\nabla u)|^2 \chi_{\{v>\gamma\}}\eta^q \gtrsim ⨍_Q |\nabla \left(G(v)\eta^{\frac{q}{2}}\right)|^2$ we proceed like in the proof of corollary 3.3. Putting this in the result of theorem 3.4 concludes the proof. □

4 De-Giorgi-Techinque

4.1 Preliminary Lemmas

At first we proof two important lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *(Fast geometric convergence) Let $\alpha > 0$,$C > 0$ and $b > 1$ be real numbers and a_k a sequence with the properties*

$$a_{k+1} \leq Cb^k a_k^{1+\alpha}$$

$$a_0 \leq C^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}}$$

Then we have $a_k \leq C^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{-\frac{1+k\alpha}{\alpha^2}} \to 0$

Proof. We use induction:
The base case $k = 0$ follows directly from the second property.
The induction step is straightforward: Let $a_k \leq C^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{-\frac{1+k\alpha}{\alpha^2}}$ for some k, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} a_{k+1} &\leq Cb^k a_k^{1+\alpha} \leq Cb^k \left(C^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{-\frac{1+k\alpha}{\alpha^2}}\right)^{1+\alpha} \\ &\leq Cb^k C^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{-\frac{1+(k+1)\alpha}{\alpha^2}-k} = C^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{-\frac{1+(k+1)\alpha}{\alpha^2}} \end{aligned}$$

□

From this we get an easy

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\alpha > 0$, $C > 0$, $b > 1$ and γ be real numbers and a_k a sequence with*

$$a_{k+1} \leq Cb^k a_k \left(\frac{a_k}{\gamma}\right)^{\alpha}$$

Then we have $a_k \to 0$ if $\gamma = a_0 C^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} b^{\frac{1}{\alpha^2}}$

Proof. Use Lemma 4.1 on the sequence $\frac{a_k}{\gamma}$. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $h \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_0^+)$ be an increasing function with $h(0) = 0$, $h(2t) \leq dh(t)$ and $h'(t) \sim \frac{h(t)}{t}$ and let $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be a constant and define $c_k = c\left(1 - 2^{-k}\right)$.*
Then we have for $v > c_{k+1}$

$$h(v) \lesssim 2^{k+1} \left(h(v) - h(c_k)\right)_+$$

and the constant only depends on h.

Proof. We calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} h(v) &= h(v) - h(c_k) + h(c_k) \\ &= h(v) - h(c_k) + \frac{h(c_k)}{h(c_{k+1}) - h(c_k)} \left(h(c_{k+1}) - h(c_k)\right) \\ &\leq \left(h(v) - h(c_k)\right) \frac{h(c_{k+1})}{h(c_{k+1}) - h(c_k)} \\ &\leq \frac{h(c_{k+1})}{h(c_{k+1}) - h(c_k)} (h(v) - h(c_k))_+ \end{aligned}$$

If we have $k = 0$, we have $h(c_0) = 0$ and the therefore $\frac{h(c_{k+1})}{h(c_{k+1}) - h(c_k)} = 1$. For the case $k \geq 1$ we use the intermediate value theorem of differential calculus and for some $t \in (c_k, c_{k+1})$ (implying $\frac{c}{2} \leq t \leq c$) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h(c_{k+1})}{h(c_{k+1}) - h(c_k)} &= \frac{h(c_{k+1})}{h'(t) \left(c_{k+1} - c_k\right)} \\ &\sim \frac{h(c_{k+1}) t}{h(t) \left(c \left(2^{-k} - 2^{-k-1}\right)\right)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{h(c)}{h\left(\frac{c}{2}\right)} 2^{k+1} \\ &\leq d 2^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

□

4.2 The elliptic case

We will start directly with the main theorem of this section

Theorem 4.4. *Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi, \varphi^*\}) < \infty$ which satisfies assumption 2.4, let $\boldsymbol{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ be a local weak solution to $\Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0$ on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \subset \Omega$ a ball of radius R with $2B \Subset \Omega$. Furthermore, we denote $v := |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}|$.*
Then we have

$$\sup_B \varphi(v) \lesssim \fint_{2B} \varphi(v)$$

Proof. We define

$$\begin{aligned} B_k &:= B(1 + 2^{-k}) \\ \zeta_k &\in C_0^\infty \text{ with} \\ \chi_{B_k} &\leq \zeta_k \leq \chi_{B_{k+1}} \\ |\nabla \zeta_k| &\lesssim \frac{2^k}{R} \\ \gamma_k &:= \gamma_\infty(1 - 2^{-k}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a constant to be chosen later.
In the end we want to use Corollary 4.2 on the sequence $W_k := \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_k\}}\zeta_k^q\|_1$ where $q \geq 2$ is chosen such that $\varphi(\zeta_k^{q-1}t) \leq \zeta_k^q\varphi(t)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{k+1} = \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_{k+1}^q\|_1 &\leq \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_{k+1}^q\|_{\frac{n}{n-2}} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\chi_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta_{k+1}}\|_{\frac{2}{n}} \\ &\leq \|\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}}\|^2_{\frac{2n}{n-2}} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\chi_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta_{k+1}}\|_{\frac{2}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

We now observe that with $\psi'(t) = \sqrt{\varphi'(t)t} \sim \varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the assumptions of lemma 4.3 are fulfilled because of $\Delta_2(\varphi) < \infty$ and we get $\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) \lesssim 2^{k+1}(\psi'(t) - \psi'(\gamma_k))_+ =: 2^{k+1}G_k(t)$ like in corollary 3.3 for $v > \gamma_{k+1}$. We use this and Sobolev's inequality where we note that the Sobolev constant is proportional to R^2:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}}\|^2_{\frac{2n}{n-2}} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\chi_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta_{k+1}}\|_{\frac{2}{n}} \\ \lesssim &2^{2k+2}\|G_k(v)\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}}\|^2_{\frac{2n}{n-2}} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\chi_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta_{k+1}}\|_{\frac{2}{n}} \\ \lesssim &2^{2k+2}R^2\|\nabla\left(G_k(v)\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}}\right)\|_2^2 \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\chi_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta_{k+1}}\|_1^{\frac{2}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply corollary 3.3 on the first factor. For the second factor we see that using $\chi^a_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}} = \chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}$ and $\zeta_k \equiv 1$ on $\mathrm{supp}\zeta_{k+1}$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_k\}}\zeta_k^q\|_a \geq \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_k^q\|_a\\ \geq&\varphi(\gamma_{k+1})\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_k^q\|_a \geq \varphi(\gamma_{k+1})\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\chi_{\mathrm{supp}\zeta_{k+1}}\|_a\end{aligned}$$

Putting this in our estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned}&2^{2k+2}R^2\|\nabla\left(G_k(v)\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}}\right)\|_2^2\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\chi_{\mathrm{supp}\zeta_{k+1}}\|_1^{\frac{2}{n}}\\ \lesssim&2^{2k+2}R^2\|\varphi(v)\chi_{v>\gamma_k}|\nabla\zeta_{k+1}|^2\|_1\left(\frac{\|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_k\}}\zeta_k^q\|_1}{\varphi(\gamma_{k+1})}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}\end{aligned}$$

We now observe that $\gamma_{k+1} = \gamma_\infty\left(1-2^{-(k+1)}\right) \geq \frac{\gamma_\infty}{2}$ and therefore $\varphi(\gamma_{k+1}) \geq \varphi\left(\frac{\gamma_\infty}{2}\right) \geq \Delta_2(\varphi)\varphi(\gamma_\infty)$ and using $|\nabla\zeta|^2 \leq 2^{2k}R^{-2}\chi_{\mathrm{supp}\zeta_{k+1}} \leq 2^{2k}R^{-2}\zeta_k^q$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}&2^{2k+2}R^2\|\varphi(v)\chi_{v>\gamma_k}|\nabla\zeta_{k+1}|^2\|_1\left(\frac{\|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_k\}}\zeta_k^q\|_1}{\varphi(\gamma_{k+1})}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}\\ \lesssim&2^{4k}\|\varphi(v)\chi_{v>\gamma_k}\zeta_k^q\|_1\left(\frac{\|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_k\}}\zeta_k^q\|_1}{\varphi(\gamma_\infty)}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} = 2^{4k}W_k\left(\frac{W_k}{\varphi\left(\gamma_\infty\right)}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}\end{aligned}$$

In total we have $W_{k+1} \lesssim 2^{4k}W_k\left(\frac{W_k}{\varphi(\gamma_\infty)}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}$ and can apply corollary 4.2 on W_k. This means we have $W_k \to 0$ if $\varphi(\gamma_\infty) \sim W_0$ but this gives $\chi_{v>\gamma_\infty} = 0$ and therefore $\varphi(v) \leq \varphi(\gamma_\infty)$ on $\mathrm{supp}\zeta_\infty = B$. So in the end we get on B:

$$\varphi(v) < \varphi\left(\gamma_\infty\right) \sim a_0 = \fint_{2B}\varphi(v)\chi_{v>0}\zeta_0^2 \leq \fint_{2B}\varphi(v)$$

□

4.3 The parabolic case

At first we define for a sequence of C_0^∞-functions ζ_k the norm

$$\|f\|_{L^s(L^r)(k)} := \left\|\|f\|_{L^s\left(\zeta_k^q \,\mathrm{d}x\right)}\right\|_{L^r(\,\mathrm{d}t)} = \left(\fint \left(\fint f^r \zeta_k^q \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{s}{r}} \,\mathrm{d}t\right)^{\frac{1}{s}}$$

and based on this

$$\begin{aligned} Y_k &:= \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_k\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k)} \\ Z_k &:= \|v^2\chi_{\{v>\gamma_k\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k)} \\ W_k &:= Y_k + \frac{1}{\alpha} Z_k \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\varphi_{loc}(J\times\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)\cap C_{loc}(I, L^2_{loc}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m))$ with $v := |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| \in L^\varphi_{loc}(J\times\Omega)\cap L^2_{loc}(\Omega)$ be a local weak solution to $\partial_t \boldsymbol{u} - \Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0$ on a cylindrical domain $J\times\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ and let $Q = I\times B \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ be a cylinder in space-time with Radius R_x in space and height R_t in time with $R_t = \alpha R_x^2$. Let the sequences $\zeta_k \in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}\right)$ and $\gamma_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$ have the following properties:*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_k &= 2\left(1+2^{-k}\right)Q =: I_k \times B_k \\ \chi_{Q_k} &\le \zeta_k \le \chi_{Q_{k+1}} \\ \left|\nabla\left(\zeta_k^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)\right| &\lesssim R_x^{-1} 2^k \\ \left|\partial_t\left(\zeta_k^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)\right| &\lesssim R_t^{-1} 2^k \\ \gamma_k &= \gamma_\infty\left(1-2^{-k}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\|v^2\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty(L^1)(k+1)} \lesssim 2^{3k}\alpha W_k \tag{4.1}$$

$$\|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1\left(L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \lesssim 2^{3k} W_k \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. We recall the energy inequality 3.25 from corollary 3.6 with $\eta = \left(\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha}\fint_B H_k(v)\zeta_{k+1}^{q\frac{n}{n-2}} \,\mathrm{d}x + R_x^2 \fint_Q \left|\nabla\left(G\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)\right|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z \\ \lesssim & R_x^2 \fint_Q \varphi(v)\left|\nabla\left(\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)\right|^2 \chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}} \,\mathrm{d}z + R_x^2 \fint_Q H(v)\zeta_{k+1}^{(q-1)\frac{n}{n-2}} \partial_t\left(\zeta^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right) \,\mathrm{d}z \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

At first we estimate the terms on the right hand side of 4.3 and note that $\zeta_k \equiv 1$ on $\mathrm{supp}\zeta_{k+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} R_x^2 \fint_Q \varphi(v)\chi_{v>\gamma_k} \left|\nabla\left(\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}z &\lesssim 2^{2k} \fint_Q \varphi(v)\chi_{v>\gamma_k}\chi_{\mathrm{supp}\chi_{k+1}} \mathrm{d}z \\ &\leq 2^{2k} \fint_Q \varphi(v)\chi_{v>\gamma_k}\zeta_k^q \mathrm{d}z \\ &= 2^{2k} Y_k \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_x^2 \fint_Q H_k(v)\left(\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)^{q-1} \left|\partial_t\left(\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)\right| \mathrm{d}z &\lesssim \frac{2^{k+1}R_x^2}{R_t} \fint_Q v^2\chi_{v>\gamma_k}\chi_{\mathrm{supp}\chi_{k+1}} \mathrm{d}z \\ &\lesssim \frac{2^k}{\alpha} \fint_Q v^2\chi_{v>\gamma_k}\zeta_k^q \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \frac{2^k}{\alpha} Z_k \leq \frac{2^{2k}}{\alpha} Z_k \end{aligned}$$

Putting this in 4.3 gives

$$\sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha} \fint_B H_k(v)\zeta_{k+1}^{q\frac{n}{n-2}} \mathrm{d}x + R_x^2 \fint_Q \left|\nabla\left(G\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}z \lesssim 2^{2k} W_k \tag{4.4}$$

To prove 4.1 we use lemma 4.3 with $h(t) = t^2$ to get $v^2 \lesssim 2^k H_k(v)$ for $v > \gamma_{k+1}$ and we see that $\zeta \leq \zeta^{\frac{n-2}{n}}$ as $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$. Putting this in 4.4 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^2\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty(L^1)(k+1)} &= \alpha \sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha} \fint_B v^2\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_{k+1}^q \mathrm{d}x \\ &\lesssim \alpha 2^k \sup_I \frac{1}{\alpha} \fint_B H_k(v)\left(\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)^q \mathrm{d}x \\ &\lesssim \alpha 2^{3k} W_k \end{aligned}$$

For inequality 4.2 we set $h(t) = \varphi(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in lemma 4.3 and get $\varphi(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim 2^k G_k(t)$ for $t > \gamma_{k+1}$ like in the elliptic case. We also use Sobolev's inequality

and note that its constant is proportional to R_x^2.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1\left(L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} &= \|\|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_{k+1}^{q\frac{n-2}{n}}\|_{L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}(\mathrm{d}x)}\|_{L^1(\mathrm{d}t)} \\
&= \|\|\varphi(v)^{\frac{1}{2}}\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}\frac{n-2}{n}}\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}(\mathrm{d}x)}\|_{L^1(\mathrm{d}t)} \\
&\lesssim 2^k\|\|G_k(v)\zeta_{k+1}^{\frac{q}{2}\frac{n-2}{n}}\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}(\mathrm{d}x)}\|_{L^1(\mathrm{d}t)} \\
&\lesssim 2^k R_x^2\|\|\nabla\left(G_k(v)\zeta^{\frac{q}{2}\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)\|^2_{L^2(\mathrm{d}x)}\|_{L^1(\mathrm{d}t)} \\
&= 2^k R_x^2 \fint\left|\nabla\left(G_k(v)\zeta^{\frac{q}{2}\frac{n-2}{n}}\right)\right|^2\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&\lesssim 2^{3k}W_k
\end{aligned}$$

□

We will now specialize to the case $\varphi(t) = t^p$. To find the optimal upper bound in the parabolic p-Laplacian case we want to use all the information we get from the lemma we have just proved. With the weak type estimate

$$\|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^r(L^q)(k+1)} > \gamma_{k+1}\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^r(L^q)(k+1)} \tag{4.5}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^p\left(L^{p\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} &\lesssim 2^{\frac{3k}{p}}W_k^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
\|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} &\lesssim \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}2^{\frac{3k}{2}}W_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)} \leq \frac{\|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)}}{\gamma_{k+1}} &\lesssim 2^{\frac{3k}{p}}\frac{W_k^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\gamma_\infty} \\
\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \leq \frac{\|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)}}{\gamma_{k+1}} &\lesssim 2^{\frac{3k}{2}}\frac{\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}W_k^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\gamma_\infty} \\
\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} &\leq 1
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

As in the elliptic case we want to apply corollary 4.2 on W_k. To get to the point where this is possible we use at first Hölder's inequality and then use the interpolation of Bochner-Lebesgue-spaces (cf lemma 5.1 in the appendix) in both factors between the spaces where we have information about the norms.

We start by estimating Y. For simplicity we drop the 2^k-factors for now.

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{p}} =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)} \\
\leq& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^r(L^s)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^{r'}(L^{s'})(k+1)} \\
\leq& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\theta}_{L^p\left(L^p\frac{n}{n-2}\right)(k+1)} \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{1-\theta}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \\
& \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\alpha_1}_{L^p\left(L^p\frac{n}{n-2}\right)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\alpha_2}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\alpha_3}_{L^\infty(L^\infty)(k+1)} \\
\lesssim& \frac{W_k^{\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2}} \alpha^{\frac{1-\theta+\alpha_2}{2}}}{\gamma_\infty^{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}}
\end{aligned}$$

This can be rearranged to

$$Y_{k+1} \lesssim W_k \left(\frac{W_k \alpha^{\frac{p}{2}\frac{1-\theta+\alpha_2}{p(\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2})-1}}}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{p(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}{p(\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2})-1}}} \right)^{p(\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2})-1} \tag{4.7}$$

To fix the parameters we get the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p} &= \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = \frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{s'} \\
\frac{1}{r} &= \frac{\theta}{p} \\
\frac{1}{s} &= \frac{\theta}{p\frac{n}{n-2}} + \frac{1-\theta}{2} \\
\frac{1}{r'} &= \frac{\alpha_1}{p} \\
\frac{1}{s'} &= \frac{\alpha_1}{p\frac{n}{n-2}} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \\
1 &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

From this we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1 &= 1-\theta \\
\alpha_2 &= \frac{np(\theta-1)+4}{np} \\
\alpha_3 &= \frac{np-4}{pn}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

and we are free to choose $\theta \in (0,1)$ as long as we ensure that the α_i are non-negative. For α_1 this is always the case. To get $\alpha_2 \geq 0$ we just have to

choose θ large enough to have $\frac{np-4}{np} < \theta$. As α_3 is not dependent on θ, we have to deal with the restriction $np \geq 4$ in another way. This will be done later. For now we just note that because of $n \geq 2$, we do not have problems for $p \geq 2$. We put 4.9 in 4.7 and get:

$$Y_{k+1} \lesssim W_k \left(\frac{W_k \alpha}{\gamma_\infty^2} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \tag{4.10}$$

We will now do the same for Z:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^2(L^2)(k+1)} \leq \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^r(L^s)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^{r'}(L^{s'})(k+1)} \\
\leq& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\theta}_{L^p(L^p\frac{n}{n-2})(k+1)} \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{1-\theta}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \\
& \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\alpha_1}_{L^p(L^p\frac{n}{n-2})(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\alpha_2}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\alpha_3}_{L^\infty(L^\infty)(k+1)} \\
\leq& \frac{W_k^{\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2}} \alpha^{\frac{1-\theta+\alpha_2}{2}}}{\gamma_\infty^{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}}
\end{aligned}$$

This can be rearranged to

$$Z_{k+1} \lesssim W_k \left(\frac{W_k \alpha^{\frac{1-\Theta+\alpha_2}{2\left(\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2}\right)-1}}}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}{2\left(\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2}\right)-1}}} \right)^{2\left(\frac{\theta}{p}+\frac{1-\theta}{2}+\frac{\alpha_1}{p}+\frac{\alpha_2}{2}\right)-1} \tag{4.11}$$

We can substitute p by 2 in the first equation of 4.8 and get

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1 &= \frac{1}{2}p - \theta \\
\alpha_2 &= \frac{n(\theta-1)+2}{n} \\
\alpha_3 &= \frac{n(4-p)-4}{2n}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

One more time we are allowed to choose Θ freely between 0 and 1 if we ensure that the α_i are non-negative. For this to be possible for α_1 and α_2 we need a Θ with $\frac{1}{2}p \geq \Theta \geq 1 - \frac{2}{n}$. This is only possible for $p \geq 2 - \frac{4}{n}$. α_3 is independent of Θ and we need $n(4-p)-4 \geq 0$ which means $p \leq 2(2-\frac{2}{n})$. In this case we put 4.12 in 4.11 and get using $\nu_2 := \frac{n}{2}(p-2)+4$:

$$Z_{k+1} \lesssim W_k \left(\frac{W_k \alpha}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \tag{4.13}$$

To rule out most of the restrictions on p we first note that for $n \geq 2$ the requirement $p \leq 2(2-\frac{2}{n})$ can only be a problem for $p \geq 2$. We recall that

we did not have problems in this case with our estimate of Y. So we set $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q}$ and use Hölder, $\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}(x) \in \{0,1\}$, the weak type estimate 4.5 and 4.10:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{k+1} =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^2_{L^2(L^2)(k+1)} \leq \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^2_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)}\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^2_{L^q(L^q)(k+1)} \\ =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^2_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)}\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\frac{2p}{q}}_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)} \lesssim \frac{\|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)}}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{2p}{q}}} \\ =& \frac{Y_{k+1}}{\gamma_\infty^{p-2}} \leq W_k \left(\frac{W_k\alpha}{\gamma^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that 4.13 is true for all $p \geq 2 - \frac{4}{n}$.
In an analogous way we are now also able to get rid of the restriction $np \geq 4$ in the estimate of Y as we see that this is only a problem for $p \leq 2$. We set $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q}$ and use Hölder's inequality, $\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}(x) \in \{0,1\}$, the weak type estimate 4.5 and 4.13 to get

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{k+1} =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)} \leq \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^2(L^2)(k+1)}\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^q(L^q)(k+1)} \\ =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^2(L^2)(k+1)}\|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\frac{2p}{q}}_{L^2(L^2)(k+1)} \lesssim \frac{\|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^2_{L^2(L^2)(k+1)}}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{2p}{q}}} \\ =& \frac{Y_{k+1}}{\gamma_\infty^{2-p}} \leq W_k \left(\frac{W_k\alpha}{\gamma^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

This means 4.10 is valid for all $p > 1$. If we now add 4.10 and $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ times 4.13 we get the estimate for W:

$$W_{k+1} \lesssim W_k \left(\min\left\{\frac{W_k\alpha}{\gamma_\infty^2}, \frac{W_k\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{n}}}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}\right\}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \tag{4.14}$$

We see that this is independent of Θ and we still have the assumption $p > 2 - \frac{4}{n}$. Assuming this a priori leads to an easier proof of those estimates (and therefore estimates on v via corollary 4.2).

Theorem 4.6. *Let $p > 2-\frac{4}{n}$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^p_{loc}(J, W^{1,p}_{loc}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap C_{loc}(J, L^2_{loc}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m))$ with $v := |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| \in L^2_{loc}(J\times\Omega)$ be a local weak solution to the parabolic p-Laplacian equation $\partial_t \boldsymbol{u} - \Delta_p \boldsymbol{u} = 0$ on a cylindrical Domain $J \times \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$. Denote $\nu_2 = n(p-2)+4$. For a cylinder $Q = I \times B$ with $2Q \Subset J \times \Omega$ and $R_t = \alpha R_x^2$ as before we have*

$$\min\left\{\frac{v^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{n}}}, \frac{v^2}{\alpha}\right\} \leq \fint_{2Q} \frac{v^2}{\alpha} + v^p$$

Proof. We use the definitions from lemma 4.5 and get using equations 4.6 and 4.5:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{k+1} =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)} \\
\leq& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^p\left(L^{p\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^\infty\left(L^{\frac{pn}{2}}\right)(k+1)} \\
=& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^p\left(L^{p\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\frac{4}{n}}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \\
=& \|v\chi_{v<\gamma_{k+1}}\|^p_{L^p(L^p)(k+1)} \|\chi_{v<\gamma_{k+1}}\|^{\frac{4}{n}}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k} W_k \frac{2^{3k\frac{2}{n}} W_k^{\frac{2}{n}} \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{4}{n}}} = 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{W_k \alpha}{\gamma^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate Z note that for $p > 2 - \frac{4}{n}$ the function $t^{p-2+\frac{4}{n}}$ is increasing.

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{k+1} =& \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^2_{L^2(L^2)(k+1)} = \|v^2\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k+1)} \\
=& \left\| \frac{v^{p-2+\frac{4}{n}}}{v^{p-2+\frac{4}{n}}} v^2 \chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}} \right\|_{L^1(L^1)(k+1)} \\
\leq& \frac{1}{\gamma_{k+1}^{p-2+\frac{4}{n}}} \|v^{p+\frac{4}{n}}\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k+1)} \\
\lesssim& \frac{1}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{2\nu_2}{n}}} \|v^p\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1\left(L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|v^{\frac{4}{n}}\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty\left(L^{\frac{2}{n}}\right)(k+1)} \\
=& \frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{\nu_2}{n}}} \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^p_{L^p\left(L^{p\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|v\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\frac{4}{n}}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{\alpha W_k}{\gamma^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

This means we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{k+1} =& Y_{k+1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} Z_{k+1} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\alpha \frac{W_k}{\gamma_\infty^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} + 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} \frac{1}{\alpha} W_k \left(\frac{W_k \alpha}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \max\left\{ \left(\frac{W_k \alpha}{\gamma_\infty^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}, \left(\frac{W_k \alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \right\} \\
=& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{W_k}{\min\left\{ \frac{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{\gamma_\infty^2}{\alpha} \right\}} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Like in the elliptic case we conclude with corollary 4.2 that $W_k \to 0$ for $W_0 \sim \min\left\{\gamma^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}, \gamma^2\right\}$ and we therefore get on Q:

$$
\min\left\{ \frac{v^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{v^2}{\alpha} \right\} < \min\left\{ \frac{\gamma_\infty^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{\gamma_\infty^2}{\alpha} \right\} \sim W_0 = \fint v^p + \frac{v^2}{\alpha}
$$

□

We remark that we have $\frac{\nu_2}{2} < p$ for $p < 2$ and $\frac{\nu_2}{2} > p$ for $p > 2$.

To generalize the p-Laplacian case back to the φ-Laplacian we have to "translate" the assumptions on p to assumptions on an N-function φ. As we do not have an easy relationship between $\|f\|_\varphi = \inf\left\{k > 0 : \int \frac{\varphi}{k} \leq 1\right\}$ and $\int \varphi(v)$ we cannot use Bochner spaces like before. The proof we got at the end of the previous section is nonetheless easy to generalize. The final theorem of this thesis reads:

Theorem 4.7. *Let φ be an N-Function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi, \varphi^*\}) < \infty$ satisfying assumption 2.4 where $\rho(t)^{\frac{2}{n}} := \varphi(t) t^{\frac{4}{n}-2}$ is an increasing function and let $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^\varphi_{\text{loc}}(J \times \Omega) \cap C_{loc}(J, L^2_{loc}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m))$ with $v := |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| \in L^\varphi_{loc}(J \times \Omega) \cap L^2_{loc}(J, L^2_{loc}(\Omega))$ be a local weak solution to the parabolic φ-Laplacian equation*

$$
\partial_t \boldsymbol{u} - \Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0
$$

on a cylindrical domain $J \times \Omega$. For a cylinder $Q = I \times B$ with $2Q \Subset J \times \Omega$ and $R_t = \alpha R_x^2$ we have

$$
\min\left\{ \frac{\rho(v)}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{v^2}{\alpha} \right\} \lesssim \fint_{2Q} \frac{v^2}{\alpha} + \varphi(v)
$$

Proof. We proceed as we did in the p-Laplacian case and use the definitions from lemma 4.5. For Y we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{k+1} =& \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k+1)} \\
\leq& \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1\left(L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty\left(L^{\frac{n}{2}}\right)(k+1)} \\
=& \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1\left(L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|^{\frac{4}{n}}_{L^\infty(L^2)(k+1)} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{W_k\alpha}{\gamma_\infty^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

And now for Z:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{k+1} =& \|v^2\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k+1)} = \|\frac{\rho(v)^{\frac{2}{n}}}{\rho(v)^{\frac{2}{n}}} v^2\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k+1)} \\
\leq& \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma_{k+1})^{\frac{2}{n}}} \|\varphi(v)v^{\frac{4}{n}}\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1(L^1)(k+1)} \\
\lesssim& \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma_\infty)^{\frac{2}{n}}} \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1\left(L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|v^{\frac{4}{n}}\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^\infty\left(L^{\frac{2}{n}}\right)(k+1)} \\
=& \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma_\infty)^{\frac{2}{n}}} \|\varphi(v)\chi_{\{v>\gamma_{k+1}\}}\|_{L^1\left(L^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right)(k+1)} \|v\chi_{v^2>\gamma_{k+1}}\|^{\frac{2}{n}}_{L^\infty(L^1)(k+1)} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{W_k\alpha}{\rho(\gamma_\infty)}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

In total, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{k+1} =& Y_{k+1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} Z_{k+1} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{W_k\alpha}{\gamma_\infty^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} + \frac{1}{\alpha} 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{W_k\alpha}{\rho(\gamma_\infty)}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \\
\lesssim& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \max\left\{ \left(\frac{W_k\alpha}{\gamma_\infty^2}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}, \left(\frac{W_k\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{n}}}{\rho(\gamma_\infty)}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \right\} \\
=& 2^{3k\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)} W_k \left(\frac{W_k}{\min\left\{\frac{\rho(\gamma_\infty)}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{\gamma_\infty^2}{\alpha}\right\}}\right)^{\frac{2}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows as before from corollary 4.2 as we have $W_k \to 0$ for $\min\left\{\frac{\rho(\gamma_\infty)}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{\gamma_\infty^2}{\alpha}\right\} \sim W_0$:

$$\min\left\{\frac{\rho(v)}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{v^2}{\alpha}\right\} < \min\left\{\frac{\rho\left(\gamma_\infty\right)}{\alpha^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}, \frac{\gamma_\infty^2}{\alpha}\right\} \sim W_0 = \fint \varphi(v) + \frac{v^2}{\alpha}$$

□

5 Appendix

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{A}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{A}_2, \mu_2)$ be measure spaces and denote the corresponding Lebesgue-Bochner-spaces by $L^p(L^q) := L^p(\Omega_1, L^q(\Omega_2, \mathbb{R}^m))$.*

(a) *Let p,p_1, p_2, q, q_1, q_2 be real numbers greater than 1 or infinity with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ ($\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$) and let $f \in L^{p_1}(L^{q_1})$ and $g \in L^{p_2}(L^{q_2})$.*
Then we have $fg \in L^p(L^q)$ and $\|fg\|_{L^p(L^q)} \leq \|f\|_{L^{p_1}(L^{q_1})} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}(L^{q_2})}$

(b) *Let p_0, p_1, q_0, q_1 be real numbers greater than 1 or infinity and let $f \in L^{p_0}(L^{q_1}) \cap L^{p_2}(L^{q_2})$ Then for $\Theta \in [0,1]$ with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\Theta}{p_1} + \frac{1-\Theta}{p_0}$ and $\frac{1}{1} = \frac{\Theta}{q_1} + \frac{1-\Theta}{q_0}$ we have $f \in L^p(L^q)$.*

Proof. (a)

$$\begin{aligned}\|fg\|_{L^p(L^q)} &= \| \|fg\|_{L^p} \|_{L^q} \leq \| \|f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}} \|_{L^q} \\ &\leq \| \|f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|_{L^{q_1}} \| \|g\|_{L^{p_2}} \|_{L^{q_2}} = \|f\|_{L^{p_1}(L^{q_1})} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}(L^{q_2})}\end{aligned}$$

(b) We use the Hölder-type estimate from above

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{L^p(L^q)} &= \|f^\Theta f^{1-\Theta}\|_{L^p(L^q)} \leq \|f^\Theta\|_{L^{\frac{p_1}{\Theta}}\left(L^{\frac{q_1}{\Theta}}\right)} \|f^{1-\Theta}\|_{L^{\frac{p_0}{1-\Theta}}\left(L^{\frac{q_0}{1-\Theta}}\right)} \\ &= \|f\|^\Theta_{L^{p_1}(L^{q_1})} \|f\|^{1-\Theta}_{L^{p_0}(L^{q_0})}\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.2. *Let φ be an N-Function with $\Delta_2(\varphi) < \infty$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(a) $||f_n - f||_\varphi \to 0$

(b) $\int \varphi(|f_n - f|) \to 0$

and those imply

$$\left| \int \varphi(|f_n|) - \int \varphi(|f|) \right| \to 0 \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. ([18] Theorem 3.14.12) We show the theorem for $f = 0$. For the general case we can just use $g_n = f_n - f$.
(a)⇒(b): As we have $\|f_n\|_\varphi \to 0$ we have $\|f_n\|_\varphi \leq 1$ for n large enough. This leads to

$$\int \varphi(|f_n|) = \int \varphi\left(\frac{\|f_n\|_\varphi f_n}{\|f_n\|_\varphi}\right) \leq \|f_n\|_\varphi \int \varphi\left(\frac{f_n}{\|f_n\|_\varphi}\right) \leq \|f_n\|_\varphi \to 0$$

(b)⇒(a): Take $\varepsilon > 0$. Because of the Δ_2-regularity of φ we have

$$\int \varphi\left(\frac{|f_n|}{\varepsilon}\right) \leq c_\varepsilon \int \varphi(|f_n|)$$

As $\int \varphi(|f_n|) \to 0$ there is an N such that $\int \varphi(|f_n|) \leq \frac{1}{c_\varepsilon}$. But this means $\|f_n\|_\varphi \leq \varepsilon$.
For the last assertion it suffices to show that $\int \varphi(|f+g|) \lesssim \int(\varphi(|f|)+\varphi(|g|))$. With the convexity and monotony of φ and the Δ_2-condition we get

$$\varphi(|f+g|) \leq \varphi(|f|+|g|) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\varphi(2|f|)+\varphi(2|g|)\right) \leq \frac{\Delta_2(\varphi)}{2}\left(\varphi(|f|)+\varphi(|g|)\right)$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Let φ be a Δ_2-regular N-function and Ω a bounded domain. Then the space of C^∞-functions on Ω is dense in the Orlicz space $K^\varphi(\Omega)$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the L^p case using that convergence in mean and convergence in norm are the same for a Δ_2-regular φ. At first, we show that simple functions are dense in K^φ:
Since $\varphi(|\mathbf{u}|) \in L^1$, we can find an increasing sequence of simple functions with $\int \varphi(|\mathbf{u}_n|) \nearrow \int \varphi(|\mathbf{u}|)$ by the definition of the Lebesgue integral. Since $\varphi(|\mathbf{u}_n|) \geq \varphi(|\mathbf{u}|)$ almost everywhere we have $\int |\varphi(|\mathbf{u}|)-\varphi(|\mathbf{u}_n|)| \to 0$ and can find a subsequence $\mathbf{v}_n$ with $\mathbf{v}_n \to \mathbf{u}$ almost everywhere. By the monotone convergence theorem we therefore get $\int \varphi(|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}_n|) \to 0$.
As we can approximate any simple function by a C^∞-function in every L^p-space we can do so in L^φ-spaces as well as we have $\varphi(t) \lesssim (t^{\alpha_1}+t^{\alpha_2})\varphi(1)$ (see [20]) by taking a sequence of C^∞-functions u_n with (w.l.o.g. $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$) $\|\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}\|_{\alpha_1} \to 0$. Then we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \varphi(|\mathbf{u}_n-\mathbf{u}|) &\lesssim \varphi(1)\left(\|\mathbf{u}_n-\mathbf{u}\|_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_1} + \|\mathbf{u}_n-\mathbf{u}\|_{\alpha_2}^{\alpha_2}\right) \\ &\leq \varphi(1)\left(\|\mathbf{u}_n-\mathbf{u}\|_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_1} + |\Omega|^{\frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{\alpha_1\alpha_2}}\|\mathbf{u}_n-\mathbf{u}\|_{\alpha_1}^{\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}}\right) \to 0\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *Let φ be a Δ_2-regular N-function and ξ_ε a standard mollifier. Denote by ω^ε the outer parallel set of $\omega \Subset \Omega$. Then for $\omega^\varepsilon \Subset \Omega$ we have:*

$$\int_\omega \varphi(|\boldsymbol{u}_\varepsilon|) \leq \int_{\omega^\varepsilon} \varphi(|\boldsymbol{u}|)$$

.

Proof. For L^1_{loc}-functions $\mathbf{u}$ we get using $\int \xi = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\limits_{\omega}\int\limits_{\omega^\varepsilon} \xi_\varepsilon(y-x)|\mathbf{u}(y)|\,\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}x\\ \leq&\int\limits_{\omega^\varepsilon}\int\limits_{\omega\cap B_\varepsilon(y)} \xi_\varepsilon(y-x)\,\mathrm{d}x|\mathbf{u}(y)|\,\mathrm{d}y \leq \int\limits_{\omega^\varepsilon}|\mathbf{u}(y)|\,\mathrm{d}y\end{aligned}$$

We now define an x-dependent measure via $\mathrm{d}\mu_x = \xi_\varepsilon(y-x)\,\mathrm{d}y$ and note that $\int_{\omega^\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\mu_x = 1$. Using Jensen's inequality and the above result with the L^1_{loc}-function $\varphi(|\mathbf{u}|)$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\limits_{\omega}\varphi\left(\left|\int\limits_{\omega^\varepsilon}\xi_\varepsilon(y-x)\mathbf{u}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\right|\right)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int\limits_{\omega}\varphi\left(\int\limits_{\omega^\varepsilon}|\mathbf{u}(y)|\mathrm{d}\mu_x\right)\,\mathrm{d}x\\ \leq&\int\limits_{\omega}\int\limits_{\omega^\varepsilon}\varphi\left(|\mathbf{u}(y)|\right)\mathrm{d}\mu_x\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int\limits_{\omega^\varepsilon}\varphi(|\mathbf{u}(y)|)\,\mathrm{d}y\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.5. *Let φ be a Δ_2-regular N-function and ξ_ε a standard mollifier. Then for every $\boldsymbol{u}\in L^\varphi_{loc}$ we have $\boldsymbol{u}_\varepsilon := \boldsymbol{u}*\xi_\varepsilon \to \boldsymbol{u}$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$.*

Proof. Take an $\omega \Subset \Omega$. We know that for smooth functions $\mathbf{v}$ we have $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \to \mathbf{v}$ locally uniform and therefore also in φ-mean and in the φ-Luxemburg norm. Let $\delta > 0$ be fixed. For $\mathbf{u}\in L^\varphi$ we chose a $\mathbf{v}\in C^\infty$ such that $\|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}\|_{\varphi,\omega^{\varepsilon_0}} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}$ for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. We also chose $0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_0$ small enoug that $\|\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{v}\|_{\varphi,\omega} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}$holds. Then we get:

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{\varphi,\omega} \leq \|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}\|_{\varphi,\omega} + \|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon\|_{\varphi,\omega} + \|\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon-\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{\varphi,\omega}\\ \leq&\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}\|_{\varphi,\omega} + \|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon\|_{\varphi,\omega} + \|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}\|_{\varphi,\omega^{\varepsilon_0}} < \delta\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.6. *(cf [19] Lemma 20) Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\}) < \infty$ and $[\boldsymbol{P},\boldsymbol{Q}]_s = s\boldsymbol{P}+(1-s)\boldsymbol{Q}$ as before. Then we have*

$$\int\limits_0^1 \frac{\varphi'(|[\boldsymbol{P},\boldsymbol{Q}]_s|)}{|[\boldsymbol{P},\boldsymbol{Q}]_s|}\,\mathrm{d}s \sim \frac{\varphi'(|\boldsymbol{P}|+|\boldsymbol{Q}|)}{|\boldsymbol{P}|+|\boldsymbol{Q}|}$$

Proof. Because of $\Delta_2(\varphi^*) < \infty$ we have (cf [21] Lemmas 1.2.2 and 1.2.3) a $\theta\in(0,1)$ and an N-function ρ such that $\varphi^\theta \sim \rho$ with $\Delta_2(\{\rho,\rho^*\}) < \infty$ and

$\rho'(t)t \sim \rho(t)$ and therefore $\varphi'(t) \sim \frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \sim \frac{\rho(t)^{\frac{1}{\Theta}}}{t} \sim \rho'(t)t^{\frac{1}{\Theta}-1}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 \frac{\varphi'(|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|)}{|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|}\,\mathrm{d}s &\lesssim \int_0^1 \rho'(|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|^{\frac{1}{\theta}-2}\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\leq \left(\rho'(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \int_0^1 |[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|^{\frac{1}{\theta}-2}\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\lesssim \left(\rho'(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} (|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)^{\frac{1}{\theta}-2} \\
&= \frac{(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)(\rho'(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{S}|))^{\frac{1}{\theta}}}{(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)^2} \\
&\sim \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)}{|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|) \sim \int_0^1 |[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|\,\mathrm{d}s$.
For the other direction we see using $\varphi(t) \sim \varphi'(t)t$, $|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s| \leq |\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|$ and Jensen's inequality that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\varphi'(|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|)}{|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|}\,\mathrm{d}s \gtrsim \int_0^1 \frac{\varphi(|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|)}{(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)^2} \geq \frac{\varphi\left(\int_0^1 |[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|\,\mathrm{d}s\right)}{(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)^2}$$

We now use that $\int_0^1 |[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|\,\mathrm{d}s \gtrsim c(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)$ (see for example [6]) and use the Δ_2 regularity of φ:

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\varphi'(|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|)}{|[\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}]_s|}\,\mathrm{d}s \gtrsim \frac{\varphi\left(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|\right)}{(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|)^2} \sim \frac{\varphi'\left(|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|\right)}{|\mathbf{P}|+|\mathbf{Q}|}$$

□

Lemma 5.7. *Let φ be an N-function satisfying assumption 2.4. Then the associated N-function ψ defined via $\psi'(t) = \sqrt{t\varphi'(t)}$ also satisfies assumption 2.4 and we have $\psi''(t) \sim \sqrt{\varphi''(t)}$*

Proof. We get

$$t\psi''(t) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t\varphi'(t)}}\left(\varphi'(t)+t\varphi''(t)\right) \sim \sqrt{t\varphi'(t)} = \psi'(t)$$

and use this to show

$$t\psi''(t) \sim \psi'(t) = \sqrt{t\varphi'(t)} \sim \sqrt{t^2\varphi''(t)} = t\sqrt{\varphi''(t)}$$

□

Lemma 5.8. *Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\}) < \infty$. Then $\Delta_2(\{\varphi_\lambda,\varphi_\lambda^*\}_{\lambda\geq 0})$ is bounded uniformly in λ.*

Proof. (cf [19] Lemma 23) As we have $\varphi'_\lambda(t)t \sim \varphi_\lambda(t)$ uniformly in λ and $\varphi'(2t) \sim \varphi'(t)$ and $\lambda + 2t \sim \lambda + t$ we get

$$\varphi'_\lambda(2t) = \frac{\varphi'(\lambda+2t)}{\lambda+2t}2t \sim \frac{\varphi'(\lambda+t)}{\lambda+t}t = \varphi'_\lambda(t)$$

and this proves the claim for φ_λ. The proof for φ_λ^* is analogous. □

Lemma 5.9. *Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\}) < \infty$. Then we have an $\varepsilon > 0$ depending only on $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\})$ such that $\varphi_\lambda(kt) \lesssim k^{1+\varepsilon}\varphi_\lambda(t)$ holds for all $0 \leq k \leq 1$.*

Proof. (see Lemma 31 in [19]) Like in the proof of 5.6 we have an N-function ρ with $\varphi^\Theta \sim \rho$ for a $0 < \Theta < 1$. Then we get uniformly in t and k:

$$\varphi(kt) \sim (\rho(kt))^{\frac{1}{\Theta}} \sim k^{\frac{1}{\Theta}}\varphi(t)$$

This shows the claim for $\lambda = 0$ with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\Theta} - 1$. As we have $\Delta_2(\{\varphi_\lambda,\varphi_\lambda^*\}_{\lambda\geq 0})$ from lemma 5.8 the proof for φ_λ is analogous. □

Lemma 5.10. *Let φ be an N-function with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\}) < \infty$. Then we have $\varphi_\lambda(\lambda_k) \sim k^2\varphi(\lambda)$ uniformly in $0 \leq k \leq 1$*

Proof. We note that $k\lambda + \lambda \sim \lambda$ and $\varphi'(ct) \sim \varphi(t)$ because of the Δ_2 condition and estimate

$$\varphi_\lambda(k\lambda) \sim k\lambda\varphi'_\lambda(k\lambda) = k^2\lambda^2\frac{\varphi'(k\lambda+\lambda)}{k\lambda+\lambda} \sim k^2\lambda\varphi'(\lambda) \sim k^2\varphi(\lambda)$$

□

Theorem 5.11. *Let φ be an N-function satisfying assumption 2.4 with $\Delta_2(\{\varphi,\varphi^*\}) < \infty$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \in W^{1,\varphi}_{loc}(\Omega)$ be a local weak solution to $\Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0$ on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then we have $\boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u}) \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$.*

We proceed like in [19] and begin by showing the following

Theorem 5.12. *Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be a local weak solution of $\Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0$ on Ω. For a cube Q with side-length R and $5Q \Subset \Omega$ we have the inequality:*

$$\fint_Q |\tau_h \boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \frac{|h|^2}{R^2} \fint_{5Q} |\boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \tag{5.2}$$

The proof is split into two parts

Lemma 5.13. *Let u be a local weak solution of $\Delta_\varphi \boldsymbol{u} = 0$ on Ω. For a cube Q with side-length R and $4Q \Subset \Omega$ we have the inequality:*

$$\fint_0^\lambda \int_Q |\tau_s V(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \varepsilon \fint_0^\lambda \int_{4Q} |\tau_s \boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\, d\lambda + c_\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^2}{R^2} \int_{4Q} \varphi(|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}|) \,\mathrm{d}x \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. We take equation 3.2 on $2Q$ and $f \equiv 1$, multiply with h^2 and take the C^∞ function η with $\chi_Q \le \eta \le \chi_{2Q}$ and $|\nabla \eta| < R^{-1}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}), \nabla(\tau_{j,-h}(\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\eta^q))\rangle = \langle \tau_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}), \nabla(\delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u}\eta^q)\\ &= \langle \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}), \delta_{j,h}\nabla \mathbf{u}\eta^q + \delta_{j,h}\mathbf{u} q \eta^{q-1}\nabla\eta\rangle = \mathrm{I} + \mathrm{II} \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Like in 3.6 we get

$$\mathrm{I} \sim \fint_{2Q} |\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \eta^q \,\mathrm{d}x \ge \fint_Q |\tau_{j,h}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})| \,\mathrm{d}x \quad (5.5)$$

and in analogy to 3.8 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{II} &\lesssim \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h \eta^{q-1} \varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}|}(|\tau_{j,h}\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|\, h|\nabla \eta| \,\mathrm{d}s\\ &\le \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h \eta^{q-1} \frac{h}{R} \varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}|}(|\tau_{j,h}\nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}| \,\mathrm{d}s \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Replacing the factor h by λ and and $|\nabla \eta|$ by R^{-1} in 3.9 we get the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta^{q-1}\varphi'_{|\nabla \mathbf{u}|}(|\tau_h \nabla \mathbf{u}|)|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|\, \frac{\lambda}{R}\\ \lesssim &\varepsilon \eta^q |\tau_{j,h-s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \circ T_{se_j}|^2 + \varepsilon \eta^q |\tau_{j,s}\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 + c_\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^2}{R^2} \varphi\left(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}|\right) \end{aligned}$$

Putting this in 5.6 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{II} \leq & \varepsilon \frac{h}{\lambda} \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h \eta^q |\tau_{j,h-s} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \circ T_{se_j}|^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}x \\
& + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\lambda} \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h \eta^q |\tau_{j,s} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}x + c_\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^2}{R^2} \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h \varphi \left(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}| \right) \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}x \\
\leq & \varepsilon \frac{h}{\lambda} \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h |\tau_{j,h-s} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \circ T_{se_j}|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \\
& + \varepsilon \frac{h}{\lambda} \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h |\tau_{j,s} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}x + c_\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^2}{R^2} \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h \varphi \left(|\nabla \mathbf{u} \circ T_{se_j}| \right) \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}x \qquad (5.7)
\end{aligned}$$

We now note for a general $f \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$ and $s < R$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{2Q} \fint_0^h |(f \circ T_s)(x)| \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}x \\
= & \fint_0^h \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi_{2Q}(x) |(f \circ T_s)(x)| \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}s \\
= & \fint_0^h \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \underbrace{(\chi_{2Q} \circ T_{-s})}_{\leq \chi_{4Q}(x)}(x) |f(x)| \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}s \\
\leq & \int_{4Q} \fint_0^h |(f)(x)| \, \mathrm{d}s \, \mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{2Q} \fint_0^h |\left(\tau_{h-s} f \circ T_s\right)(x)| \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}x \\
=&\int_{2Q} \fint_0^h |\left(\tau_s f \circ T_{h-s}\right)(x)| \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}x \\
=&\fint_0^h \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \underbrace{(\chi_{2Q} \circ T_{s-h})(x)}_{\leq \chi_{4Q}(x)} |\left(\tau_s f\right)(x)| \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}x \\
\leq&\int_{4Q} \fint_0^h |\left(\tau_s f\right)(x)| \,\mathrm{d}s \,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

Putting those 2 estimates in 5.7 and putting it with 5.5 in 5.4 we get

$$\fint_Q |\tau_{j,h} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \leq \varepsilon \frac{h}{\lambda} \int_{4Q} \fint_0^h |\tau_{j,s} \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + c_\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^2}{R^2} \int_{4Q} \left(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|\right) \,\mathrm{d}x \quad (5.8)$$

We note that we get for any L^1-function g:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_0^\lambda \frac{h}{\lambda} \fint_0^h |g(s)| \,\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}h = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \chi_{(0,h)}(s) \chi_{(0,\lambda)}(h) |g(s)| \,\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}h \\
=&\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \chi_{(s,\lambda)}(h) \chi_{(0,\lambda)}(s) |g(s)| \,\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}h = \fint_0^\lambda \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_s^\lambda \mathrm{d}h |g(s)| \,\mathrm{d}s \\
\leq&\fint_0^\lambda |g(s)| \,\mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating 5.8 via $\fint_0^\lambda \mathrm{d}h$ proves lemma 5.13. □

To conclude the proof of theorem 5.12 we need a lemma from [19]:

Lemma 5.14. *Let γ_1, γ_2 functions such that $\gamma_i(R,h)$ is non decreasing in h and $\frac{h}{R}$. Let $f \in L^2_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $g_i \in L^2_{loc}(\Omega)$ be functions such that the following statement is true: For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $c_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every cube Q with side length R and $4Q \Subset \Omega$ and every $0 < h < R$ holds:*

$$\fint_0^\lambda \int_Q |\tau_s f|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \varepsilon \fint_0^\lambda \int_{4Q} |\tau_s f|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}s + c_\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^2 \gamma_i(R,h) \int_{4Q} g_i \,\mathrm{d}x \quad (5.9)$$

Then there exist constants $N_2(n)$ and c such that for every $0 < h < \frac{R_0}{10}$ and every cube Q_0 with $5Q_0 \Subset \Omega$ holds

$$\fint_{Q_0} |\tau_s f|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim c \sum_{i=1}^{2} \gamma_i(R,h) \fint_{5Q_0} g_i \,\mathrm{d}x \tag{5.10}$$

Proof. [19] Lemma 13. □

We are now able to prove theorem 5.12.

Proof of theorem 5.12. From lemma 5.13 we know that the assumptions of lemma 5.14 are fulfilled with $f = \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})$, $\gamma_1(R,h) = \frac{h^2}{R^2}$, $\gamma_2 = 0$ and $g_1 = \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)$. To conclude the proof we note $\gamma_1(N_2 R, N_2 h) = \gamma_1(R,h)$ □

Proof of Theorem 5.11. We divide equation 5.2 by h^2 and get

$$\fint_{Q} |\delta_h \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \fint_{5Q} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x < \infty$$

This implies the existence of $\nabla \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in L^2(Q)$ for every Cube Q with $5Q \Subset \Omega$. For any other $\omega \Subset \Omega$ we denote by $R = \operatorname{dist}(\omega, \partial\Omega)$. Take the open covering $\omega \subset \cap_{x \in \omega} Q_{\frac{R}{6}}(x) \subset \Omega$ since ω is compact we have a finite subcovering of cubes $Q_i := Q_{\frac{R}{6}}(x_i)$, $i = 1, ..., N$, with $5Q_i \Subset \Omega$. Therefore we have

$$\fint_{\omega} |\delta_h \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \fint_{5Q_i} |\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x < \infty$$

□

Theorem 5.15. *Let φ be an N-function satisfying assumption 2.4 and $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^{\varphi}_{loc}(J \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \cap C_{loc}(J, L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m))$ be a local weak solution to $\Delta_{\varphi} \boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}_t$ on a cylindric domain $J \times \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ with $v := |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| \in L^2_{loc}(J \times \Omega) \cap L^{\varphi}_{loc}(J \times \Omega)$. Then we have $\boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u}) \in L^2_{loc}(I, W^{1,2}_{loc}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m))$.*

In analogy to the elliptic case we divide the proof.

Lemma 5.16. *Let φ be an N-function satisfying assumption 2.4 and $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^{\varphi}_{loc}(J \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \cap C_{loc}(J, L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m))$ be a local weak solution to $\Delta_{\varphi} \boldsymbol{u} = \partial_t \boldsymbol{u}$ on a cylindric domain $J \times \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ with with $v := |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| \in L^2_{loc}(J \times \Omega) \cap L^{\varphi}_{loc}(J \times \Omega)$. Then for every space time cube Q of sidelength R with $4Q \Subset J \times \Omega$ and*

every $\lambda < R$ we have

$$\fint_0^\lambda \int_Q |\tau_s \boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z \le \varepsilon \fint_0^\lambda \int_{4Q} |\tau_s \boldsymbol{V}(\nabla \boldsymbol{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\,ds$$
$$+c_\varepsilon \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{R^2} \int_{4Q} \varphi(|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}|) \,\mathrm{d}z + \frac{\lambda^2}{R} \int_{4Q} |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z \right) \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. We multiply the inequality 3.23 on $2Q$ by h^2, set $f \equiv 1$ and discard II':

$$\int_{2Q'} \tau_{h,j} \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \nabla (\tau_{h,j} \mathbf{u} \rho(t) \eta^q) \,\mathrm{d}z \le h^2 \int_{2Q} H(|\delta_h \mathbf{u}|) \partial_t \left(\eta^q\right) \,\mathrm{d}z$$

We now take $\eta \in C_0^\infty$ such that $\chi_Q \le \eta \le \chi_{2Q}$, $|\nabla \eta| \le R^{-1}$ and $|\partial_t \eta| \le R^{-1}$ and get

$$\text{I"} := \int_Q \tau_{h,j} \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \nabla (\tau_{h,j} \mathbf{u}) \,\mathrm{d}z \le R^{-1} \int_{2Q} |\tau_h \mathbf{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z =: \text{II"} \tag{5.12}$$

Since $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(W^{1,2})$ we have $\frac{1}{h^2} \int_{2Q} |\tau_h \mathbf{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z \to \int_{2Q} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z$ and therefore for every $\lambda > h$

$$\text{II"} \le \frac{2}{R} h^2 \int_{2Q} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z \le 2\lambda^2 \int_{4Q} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z$$

We then handle I" like in lemma 5.13 and take $\max\{c_\varepsilon, 2\}$ as our new c_ε to get the result of lemma 5.16 □

Proof of theorem 5.15. We use the Giaquinta-Modica type lemma 5.14 with $\gamma_1(R,\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^2}{R^2}$, $\gamma_2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{R}$, $g_1 = \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)$ and $g_2 = |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2$. We get

$$\fint_Q |\tau_\lambda \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z \le c \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{R^2} \fint_{5_Q} \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|) + \frac{\lambda^2}{R} \fint_{5Q} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \right)$$

Dividing this by λ^2 leads to

$$\fint_Q |\delta_\lambda \mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u})|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z \le c \left(\frac{1}{R^2} \fint_{5_Q} \varphi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|) + \frac{1}{R} \fint_{5Q} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \right) < \infty$$

which implies $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in W^{1,2}(Q)$ for every cube Q with $5Q \Subset \Omega$. The same simple covering argument as in the elliptic case leads to $\mathbf{V}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) \in W^{1,2}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ □

References

[1] David Hilbert. Mathematische probleme. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, 1900:253–297, 1900.

[2] Ennio De Giorgi. Sulla differenziabilitae l'analiticita delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari. *Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat.*, 3(3):25–43, 1957.

[3] John Nash. Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations. *American Journal of Mathematics*, pages 931–954, 1958.

[4] Jürgen Moser. A Harnack inequality for parabolic differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 17:101–134, 1964.

[5] Karen Uhlenbeck. Regularity for a class of non-linear elliptic systems. *Acta Mathematica*, 138(1):219–240, 1977.

[6] Emilio Acerbi and Nicola Fusco. Regularity for minimizers of non-quadratic functionals: the case 1¡ p¡ 2. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 140(1):115–135, 1989.

[7] Lawrence C Evans. A new proof of local C 1, α regularity for solutions of certain degenerate elliptic pde. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 45(3):356–373, 1982.

[8] Paolo Marcellini and Gloria Papi. Nonlinear elliptic systems with general growth. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 221(2):412–443, 2006.

[9] Lars Diening, Bianca Stroffolini, and Anna Verde. Everywhere regularity of functionals with φ-growth. *manuscripta mathematica*, 129(4):449–481, 2009.

[10] Dominic Breit, Bianca Stroffolini, and Anna Verde. A general regularity theorem for functionals with φ-growth. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 383(1):226–233, 2011.

[11] Juan R Esteban and Juan L Vázquez. On the equation of turbulent filtration in one-dimensional porous media. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 10(11):1303–1325, 1986.

[12] Emmanuele DiBenedetto. *Degenerate parabolic equations*. Springer, 1993.

[13] Emmanuele DiBenedetto and Avner Friedman. Regularity of solutions of nonlinear degenerate parabolic systems. *J. reine angew. Math*, 349:83–128, 1984.

[14] Hi Jun Choe. Hölder regularity for the gradient of solutions of certain singular parabolic systems. *Communications in partial differential equations*, 16(11):1709–1732, 1991.

[15] Emilio Acerbi, Giuseppe Mingione, et al. Gradient estimates for a class of parabolic systems. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 136(2):285–320, 2007.

[16] Gary M Lieberman. Hölder regularity for the gradients of solutions of degenerate parabolic systems. *Ukr. Math. Bull*, 3:352–373, 2006.

[17] Robert A Adams and John JF Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*, volume 140. Academic press, 2003.

[18] Malempati Madhusudana Rao and Zhong Dao Ren. *Theory of Orlicz spaces*. M. Dekker New York, 1991.

[19] Lars Diening and Frank Ettwein. Fractional estimates for non-differentiable elliptic systems with general growth. In *Forum Mathematicum*, volume 20, pages 523–556, 2008.

[20] Jan Gustavsson and Jaak Peetre. Interpolation of Orlicz spaces. 60(1):33–59, 1977.

[21] Vakhtang Mikhalovich Kokilashvili and Miroslav Krbec. *Weighted inequalities in Lorentz and Orlicz spaces*, volume 57. World Scientific, 1991.